arXiv:1608.00253v1 [math-ph] 31 Jul 2016

Generalized Orbifold Construction for Conformal Nets

MARCEL BISCHOFF

Dedicated to the memory of John E. Roberts

Abstract. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a conformal net. We give the notion of a proper action of a finite hypergroup acting by vacuum preserving unital completely positive (so-called stochastic) maps, which generalizes the proper actions of finite groups. Taking fixed points under such an action gives a finite index subnet $\mathcal{B}^K$ of $\mathcal{B}$, which generalizes the G-orbifold. Conversely, we show that if $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ is a finite inclusion of conformal nets, then $\mathcal{A}$ is a generalized orbifold $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}^K$ of the conformal net $\mathcal{B}$ by a unique finite hypergroup K. There is a Galois correspondence between intermediate nets $\mathcal{B}^K \subset \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ and subhypergroups $L \subset K$ given by $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}^L$. In this case, the fixed point of $\mathcal{B}^K \subset \mathcal{A}$ is the generalized orbifold by the hypergroup of double cosets $L\backslash K/L$.

If $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ is an finite index inclusion of completely rational nets, we show that the inclusion $\mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ is conjugate to a Longo–Rehren inclusion. This implies that if $\mathcal{B}$ is a holomorphic net, and K acts properly on $\mathcal{B}$, then there is a unitary fusion category $\mathcal{F}$ which is a categorification of K and $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B}^K)$ is braided equivalent to the Drinfel'd center $Z(\mathcal{F})$. More generally, if $\mathcal{B}$ is completely rational conformal net and K acts properly on $\mathcal{B}$, then there is a unitary fusion category $\mathcal{F}$ extending $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$, such that K is given by the double cosets of the fusion ring of $\mathcal{F}$ by the Verlinde fusion ring of $\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B}^K)$ is braided equivalent to the Müger centralizer of $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$ in the Drinfel'd center $Z(\mathcal{F})$.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Prelimaries 5
3. Hypergroup Actions on Conformal Nets 13
4. Hypergroup Actions from Subfactors and Conformal Subnets 16
5. Commutative Q-systems in Unitary Modular Tensor Categories and Inclusions of Completely Rational Conformal Nets 27
6. Possible Generalization to Infinite Actions 32
Appendix A. Completely Positive Maps 33
Appendix B. Tensor Categories 36
References 37

1. Introduction

For (rational) chiral conformal theory, there are two main axiomatizations: conformal nets and vertex operator algebras. In both frameworks there is a notion of finite conformal inclusions, (finite) extensions and subtheories. Both settings have a form of rationality in which the representation categories are modular tensor categories. In this case chiral extensions and their representation theory is well understood through commutative algebra objects (called Q-systems for nets) in the representation category and dyslexic modules (called ambichiral sectors for nets), respectively, see

Date: August 2, 2016.
Supported by NSF Grant DMS-1362138.

[KO02, HKL15] for VOAs and [LR95, Müg10, BKL15] for conformal nets. A model independent understanding of subtheories exists only in the case of fixed points with respect to a finite group G, so-called G-orbifolds, see [DM97] for VOAs and [Xu00] for conformal nets. Nevertheless, the structure is already very interesting in this setting. It leads to the theory of twisted representation and G-crossed braided tensor categories [Müg05]. The present paper tries to fill the gap by introducing a model independent theory of more general fixed points.

Exotic subfactors and fusion categories lead to new modular tensor categories via the quantum double construction and there is some indication that these (maybe all) are realized by finite index subnets of holomorphic nets (= conformal nets with trivial representation category) [Bis16b]. The first idea is to look into finite index subnets of already constructed conformal nets. E.g. Evans and Gannon give indication that there should be a subtheory of the chiral theory associated with the $A_2 \times E_6$ lattice (which embeds into the holomorphic E_8 theory) which should give the double of the Haagerup subfactor as a representation category. We mention that the study of conformal inclusions/embeddings [SW86] which were studied in the framework of conformal nets in [Xu98b, Xu98a], gives many examples of finite index subnets. But given a conformal net $\mathcal{B}$ a general theory and characterization of finite index subnets $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ has not been established. Related to this, Evans and Gannon [EG11] asked if one can orbifold a holomorphic net by something more general than a group.

The goal of this paper is to define a generalized notion of an orbifold, which cover all finite conformal inclusions. This should be a generalizing of the fixed point by a finite group, a so-called G-orbifold. Such a G-orbifold is given by automorphisms $\{\alpha_g \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{A})\}_{g\in G}$ of vacuum preserving automorphisms of the net.

In our approach groups are generalized to hypergroups and actions by vacuum preserving automorphisms to actions by stochastic maps.

Stochastic maps are unital completely positive maps preserving a state and arise in the study of non-commutative probability spaces. A non-commutative probability space is a pair (M, φ) of a von Neumann algebra M and a faithful normal state φ. In particular, every local algebra $\mathcal{A}(I)$ together with its vacuum state $\varphi = (\Omega, \ \cdot\ \Omega)$ is a non-commutative probability space.

We remark that a subfactor $\mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ itself can be seen as a generalization of a group fixed point, but given a net $\mathcal{A}(I)$ there is no indication to see when a subfactor $N \subset \mathcal{A}(I)$ comes from a subnet. Further, we point out that a phenomenon of decategorification occurs. This already occurs in the case when we have a G-orbifold of a holomorphic net. Namely, we get a class $[\omega] \in H^3(G, \mathbb{T})$, which is exactly the data which gives a categorification of G as a unitary fusion category. But the action of G itself does not involve $[\omega] \in H^3(G, \mathbb{T})$. In general, in the holomorphic case we show that we get a hypergroup acting and that we get a categorification in terms of a unitary fusion category.

We point out that there is a proposal to use defects to study generalized orbifolds, [FFRS10]. But there the point is that if we have a chiral theory $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ we can get an associated full conformal field theory by knowing the correlators of e.g. the Cardy case full conformal field theory of $\mathcal{A}$. In particular, the knowledge of $\mathcal{A}$ is already assumed. Defects can be defined for conformal nets on the line as in [BKLR16] and there is a connection between the action of the stochastic map and the physical behaviour of the defect. Namely, let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ and consider all $\mathcal{A}$-topological $\mathcal{B}$-$\mathcal{B}$ defects. Then $\mathcal{A}$ can be characterized to be the maximal subnet of $\mathcal{B}$, which is invisible for all $\mathcal{B}$-$\mathcal{B}$ defects. By identifying the left and right copy of $\mathcal{B}$ we get an action on the observables of $\mathcal{B}$ as in [BKLR16, Sec 5.4]. Our approach to generalized orbifolds presented in this paper are based on this observation. We will present the relationship between generalized orbifolds presented here and phase boundaries in [BKLR16] in a future publication.

The main results. We introduce the following subfamilies of conformal nets:

$$\{\text{holomorphic nets}\} \subset \{\text{quantum double nets}\} \subset \{\text{completely rational nets}\} \subset \{\text{conformal nets}\}$$

By conformal net $\mathcal{A}$ we mean a Möbius covariant local and irreducible net on the circle $\mathbb{S}^1$. It is completely rational, if it has finite μ-index, is strongly additive, and fulfills the split property. In this case, $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ is a unitary modular tensor category [KLM01]. If it happens to be the trivial category (which is equivalent with the μ-index $\mu(\mathcal{A})$ begin equal to 1), then we call $\mathcal{A}$ a holomorphic net. If $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ a finite index inclusion ($[\mathcal{B} : \mathcal{A}] < \infty$) and $\mathcal{B}$ holomorphic, we call $\mathcal{A}$ a quantum double net. This property is equivalent to $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ being braided equivalent to the unitary Drinfel'd center also called quantum double $Z(\mathcal{F})$ [Müg03b] of a unitary fusion category $\mathcal{F}$ (see e.g. [Müg10, Bis16b]).

Proposition 1.1 (see Corollary 4.2)**.** *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be a finite index subnet, then the canonical endomorphism $\gamma \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{B}(I))$ of the inclusion $\mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ has no multiplicities, i.e.* $\mathrm{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma) = \gamma(\mathcal{B}(I))' \cap \mathcal{B}(I)$ *is a commutative algebra.*

One might wonder if in this case $\mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ could be seen as the fixed points by an outer action of a Hopf algebra. This would mean that the inclusion $\mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ has depth 2. This is indeed the case if and only if it is a group fixed point.

Corollary 1.2. *If $\mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ is finite index and depth 2, or equivalently fixed point by a Kac algebra, then it is a group fixed point.*

Proof. For depth 2 we have $[\gamma] = \bigoplus_i n_i[\beta_i]$ with $d\beta_i = n_i$ [Lon94], but from Proposition 1.1 follows that γ has no multiplicities and therefore $d\beta_i = 1$ and the statement follows from [Izu91, Theorem 4.1] or the fact that the hypergroup K in Proposition 1.10 is indeed a group. □

In Section 3 (see Definition 3.1 and 3.7) we define a proper action of a hypergroup K on a conformal net $\mathcal{B}$, which generalizes the action of a finite group G by inner symmetries. A hypergroup is a finite set $K = \{c_0, \cdots, c_n\}$ which is the basis of a $*$-algebra fulfilling certain axioms (see Definition 2.3). Each element c_i has a **weight** $w_i = w_{c_i} \geq 1$ and K is a finite group if and only if $w_i = 1$ for all $c_i \in K$. The **weight of a hypergroup** K is defined to be $D(K) = \sum_{i=0}^{n} w_i$, so in particular $D(G) = |G|$ for a finite group G.

Theorem 1.3 (see Theorem 3.8 and 4.22)**.** *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a conformal net.*

(1) Let K be a hypergroup acting properly on $\mathcal{B}$, then the fixed point net $I \mapsto \mathcal{B}(I)^K$ turns out to be a finite index subnet of $\mathcal{B}$, called the ***K-orbifold net****. The index $[\mathcal{B} : \mathcal{B}^K]$ equals $D(K)$.*

(2) Conversely, let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be a finite index subnet, then there is a canonical (and unique up to equivalence) proper hypergroup action of a hypergroup K on $\mathcal{B}$, such that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}^K$. This construction recovers the action of K from (1) up to equivalence.

(3) There is a Galois correspondence between intermediate nets $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ with $\mathcal{B}^K \subset \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subset \mathcal{B}$ and subhypergroups $L \subset K$. In this case $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{B}^L$ and there is a canonical action of the hypergroup of double cosets $K//L$ on $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, such that $\mathcal{A} = \tilde{\mathcal{A}}^{K//L}$.

Let us from know on suppose that $\mathcal{B}$ is **completely rational** (then every finite index subnet $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ is completely rational by [Lon03]). In this case we get a complete characterization of how the actions of hypergroups look like.

We have the following categorical result.

Proposition 1.4 (Proposition 5.5)**.** *Let Θ be a Lagrangian Q-system in a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathcal{D} \cong {}_\Theta\mathcal{C}_\Theta$ the dual category. Then the dual Q-system $\Gamma \in \mathcal{D}$ is the Longo–Rehren Q-system associated with $\mathcal{C}_\Theta \cong \mathcal{D}^+$.*

In the case $\mathcal{B}$ is even **holomorphic** we first get the following Corollary of Propopsition 1.4.

Corollary 1.5. *Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be a finite index subnet, $\mathcal{B}$ holomorphic, then the dual Q-system of the inclusion $\mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ is a Longo–Rehren Q-system, in other words $\mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ is isomorphic to a Longo–Rehren inclusion.*

There is the following natural open question which is also related to the question if all finite index finite depth subfactors come from conformal nets [Bis16a].

Question 1.6. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a unitary fusion category. Is there a completely rational net $\mathcal{A}$, such that $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ is braided equivalent to the (unitary) Drinfel'd center $Z(\mathcal{F})$?

The following theorem says that such a net $\mathcal{A}$ is always a generalized orbifold of a holomorphic net. The special case of the theorem where $K = G$ is a finite group was announced by Müger [Müg10, 3.6 Corollary] with the missing proofs contained in the categorical work [DMNO13]. Namely, for a holomorphic net $\mathcal{B}$ and a finite group $G \subset \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{B})$ (i.e. a proper action of G on $\mathcal{B}$) we have $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B}^G) \cong \mathrm{Rep}(D^\omega(G)) \cong Z(\mathrm{Vect}_G^\omega)$ for some $[\omega] \in H^3(G, \mathbb{T})$ and conversely, if $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A}) \cong Z(\mathrm{Vect}_G^\omega)$ then there is a holomorphic net $\mathcal{B}$ with $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}^G$. Our analogous but much more general result using generalized orbifolds is:

Theorem 1.7 (holomorphic case, see Theorem 5.16)**.** *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a holomorphic conformal net with a proper action of a hypergroup K. Then there is a unitary fusion category $\mathcal{F}$, such that $K = K_\mathcal{F}$ (i.e. K is hypergroup of the fusion ring of $\mathcal{F}$) and $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B}^K)$ is braided equivalent $Z(\mathcal{F})$.*

Conversely, if $\mathcal{A}$ is a completely rational net with $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ braided equivalent to the Drinfel'd center $Z(\mathcal{F})$ for a unitary fusion category $\mathcal{F}$, then there is a holomorphic net $\mathcal{B}$ and an action of the hypergroup $K_\mathcal{F}$ associated with $\mathcal{F}$, such that $\mathcal{B}^{K_\mathcal{F}} = \mathcal{A}$.

We note that in this case $\mathcal{B}^K$ is a quantum double net and $\mathcal{F}$ is a categorification of K. An interesting problem seems to be the following: Given a holomorphic net $\mathcal{B}$, find all finite index subnets $\mathcal{A}$. Then each subnet $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ gives rise to a fusion category $\mathcal{F}_\mathcal{A}$.

We now want to discuss the case, where $\mathcal{B}$ is only assumed to be completely rational. Here one might ask: What are the possible representation categories of finite index subnets of a given net completely rational net $\mathcal{B}$ with known representation category?

Question 1.8. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a completely rational net and $\mathcal{C}$ a unitary modular tensor category. Is there a finite index subnet $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ with $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ braided equivalent to $\mathcal{C}$?

In this case it is necessary that $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$ belong to the same Witt class [DMNO13]. There is a more refined necessary—but not sufficient (see below)—condition for the existence of such a net $\mathcal{A}$:

Proposition 1.9 (see Propopsition 5.11)**.** *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a completely rational conformal net with $\mathcal{D} := \mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$. A necessary condition for the existence of a finite index subnet $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ with $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ braided equivalent to $\mathcal{C}$ is:*

There is a fusion category $\mathcal{F}$ and an injective (full) central functor $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{rev}} \to \mathcal{F}$, such that $\mathcal{C}$ is braided equivalent to the Müger centralizer $C_{Z(\mathcal{F})}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{rev}})$ (also denoted by $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{rev}\prime} \cap Z(\mathcal{F})$).

We note that this condition is not sufficient and stress the fact that the existence of subnets is not a purely categorical problem in the sense that it not only depends on $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$, but depends on the explicit net $\mathcal{B}$.

For example, take the moonshine net $\mathcal{A}^\natural$ and $\mathcal{F} \cong \mathrm{Vect}_G$ for some finite group G which does not embed into the monster group. Then there (trivially) exists such a braided central functor as above, but no action of G on $\mathcal{A}^\natural$ since $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{A}^\natural)$ is the monster group. A second family of examples are the Virasoro nets for $c < 1$ [KL04] which are rational. The Virasoro net is minimal [Car98], so it has no proper subnets at all. But one can easily see that there is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-simple current extension $\mathcal{B}_k$ of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_k} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_1} \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_k$ fulfilling $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B}_k) \cong \mathrm{Rep}(\mathrm{Vir}_{c_k})$ with $c_k = 6 - \frac{1}{(k+2)(k+3)}$. Here $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_k$ is a net with $\mathrm{Rep}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_k) \cong \mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_k})^{\mathrm{rev}}$ constructed in [Bis16b]. But $\mathcal{B}_k$ has many non-trivial subnets.

We now state the general characterization result for proper finite hypergroup actions on a completely rational net $\mathcal{B}$.

Theorem 1.10 (see Therorem 5.16)**.** *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a completely rational conformal net with a proper action of a hypergroup K. Then there exists a unitary fusion category $\mathcal{F}$, such that K is equivalent to $K_{\mathcal{F}} /\!/ K_{\mathcal{B}}$, where $K_{\mathcal{B}}$ is the hypgergroup associated with* $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$*.*

Furthermore, there is a central inclusion $\mathcal{G} := \mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})^{\mathrm{rev}} \subset \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B}^K)$ is braided equivalent to $C_{Z(\mathcal{F})}(\mathcal{G})$, the Müger centralizer of $\mathcal{G}$ in $Z(\mathcal{F})$ (also denoted by $\mathcal{G}' \cap Z(\mathcal{F})$).

While writing this manuscript, the author observed that a similar action of the double coset algebra was given in [Xu14, Section 2.11 and Theorem 3.8]. But there the focus was on intermediate nets in the case where a subnet is already known. A similar action on charged intertwiners arose in [BKLR16, BKLR15] which was motivation for the present work. An action by stochastic maps on conformal nets seem to not have appeared in the literature before.

We get the following formulae for the index of an inclusion and the μ-index:

$$[\mathcal{B}(I) : \mathcal{B}^{K/\!/H}(I)] = D(K/\!/H) \equiv \frac{D(K)}{D(H)}\,, \qquad\qquad \mu(\mathcal{B}^K) = \mu(\mathcal{B}) \cdot D(K)^2\,.$$

We remember that the μ-index $\mu(\mathcal{B})$ of a completely rational conformal net $\mathcal{B}$ coincides with the global dimension $\mathrm{Dim}(\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B}))$ of its representation category.

An interesting problem seems to be: Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a diffeomorphism covariant completely rational net with central charge $c > 1$, find all finite index subnets, or more general, find the lattice of all irreducible subnets $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$, or find all finite index subnets.

The structure of this article. In Section 2, we give some preliminaries on unitary fusion categories, hypergroups and conformal nets. In Section 3, we define generalized orbifolds in terms of actions of finite hypergroups and show that their fixed points give finite index subnets. In Section 4, we construct a hypergroup action from an arbitrary finite index inclusion of nets. We show that the action is unique and that if we start with a generalized orbifold of Section 3, this reconstructs the original hypergroup and action. Intermediate nets correspond to subhypergroups and we get an action of the hypergroup of double cosets on the intermediate net. In Section 5, we give characterization results on commutative Q-systems in unitary modular tensor categories. This gives categorical restrictions on possible inclusions of completely rational conformal nets and a complete characterization of actions of hypergroups on completely rational conformal nets and their generalized orbifolds. In Section 6, we give some outlook on possible generalization to infinite inclusions of conformal nets.

In Appendix A we collect some results on completely positive and stochastic maps. In Appendix B, we state some results for tensor categories which are more general than the one for unitary fusion categories in the one in Section 5. Some of the results are implicitly in the literature or can derived from them.

Acknowledgements. The author likes to thank Luca Giorgetti, Yasuyuki Kawahigashi, Roberto Longo, Karl-Henning Rehren and Feng Xu for remarks on earlier versions of this manuscript and Masaki Izumi and Pinhas Grossmann for discussions. The results were improved and the manuscript completed while the author visited the Hausdorff Trimester Program "Von Neumann Algebras" and the author is grateful for the hospitality of the Hausdorff Research Institute for Mathematics (HIM) in Bonn.

2. Prelimaries

2.1. **Unitary Fusion Categories.** Let M be a type III factor. We denote by $\mathrm{End}_0(M)$ the strict and rigid C*–tensor category of normal unital $*$-endomorphisms $\rho\colon M \to M$ with finite dimension $d\rho = [M : \rho(M)]^{\frac{1}{2}}$, where $[M : N]$ is the minimal Jones index. The tensor product is given by the composition $\rho \otimes \sigma = \rho \circ \sigma$ and morphisms are given by interwiners $\mathrm{Hom}(\rho, \sigma) = \{t \in M :$

$t\rho(m) = \sigma(m)t\}$. For $r \in \mathrm{Hom}(\rho, \tilde{\rho})$ and $s \in \mathrm{Hom}(\sigma, \tilde{\sigma})$ the tensor product of morphisms is given by $r \otimes s := r\rho(s) \equiv \tilde{\rho}(s)r$. We denote $\langle \rho, \sigma \rangle = \dim \mathrm{Hom}(\rho, \sigma)$. For each $\rho \in \mathrm{End}_0(M)$ there is a conjugate $\overline{\rho}$ and a standard solution [LR97] of the conjugate equation. This gives an (essentially unique) spherical structure [LR97]. An object is called irreducible, if $\mathrm{Hom}(\rho, \rho) = \mathbb{C} \cdot 1$, which is exactly the case if $\rho(M) \subset M$ is irreducible, i.e. $\rho(M)' \cap M = \mathbb{C} \cdot 1$. By a sector $[\rho]$ we denote the unitary equivalence class $\{\mathrm{Ad}\, u \circ \rho : u \textbf{ unitary in } M\}$ of an endomorphism ρ. There is a direct sum which well-defined on sectors, namely $[\rho] \oplus [\sigma]$ is given by the sector of $r_1\rho(\,\cdot\,)r_1^* + r_2\sigma(\,\cdot\,)r_2^*$ where $r_i^* r_j = \delta_{ij} 1$ and $r_1 r_1^* + r_2 r_2^* = 1$ is a representation of the generators of the Cuntz algebra $\mathcal{O}_2$ in M. We refer to [BKLR15] for more details.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a rigid C*–tensor category. Let $\rho \in \mathcal{F}$ be irreducible and $\sigma \in \mathcal{F}$ arbitrary. Then $\mathrm{Hom}(\rho, \sigma)$ is a Hilbert space with scalar product:

$$(s,t)_{\mathrm{Hom}(\rho,\sigma)} = \Phi_\rho(s^* t) \qquad \Longleftrightarrow \qquad (s,t)_{\mathrm{Hom}(\rho,\sigma)} \cdot 1_\rho = s^* t\,,$$

where Φ_ρ is the standard left inverse (see [LR97]) of ρ. Note that the first definition generalizes if ρ is not irreducible, and the second if $\mathcal{F}$ is not rigid.

A **unitary fusion category** $\mathcal{F}$ is a semisimple rigid C*-tensor category with finitely many isomorphism classes of irreducible objects. It can always be realized (in an essentially unique way) as a full and replete subcategory of $\mathrm{End}(M)$, which is closed under direct sums and subobjects, where M is the hyperfinite type III_1 factor [Pop95, HY00] (see also [Izu15]).

This way $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathrm{End}_0(M)$ is completely specified by a choice of finitely many irreducible sectors $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F})$, such that

- $[\mathrm{id}_M] \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F})$,
- $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F})$ is closed under fusion

$$[\rho \circ \sigma] = \bigoplus_{[\tau] \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F})} N_{\rho,\sigma}^{\tau} [\tau]\,, \qquad\qquad (\rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{F})$$

  for some non-negative integer coefficients $\{N_{\rho,\sigma}^{\tau} = \dim \mathrm{Hom}(\rho \otimes \sigma, \tau)\}_{[\rho],[\sigma],[\tau] \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F})}$,
- $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F})$ is closed under conjugates/duals, i.e. if $[\rho] \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F})$ then there is a conjugate $[\bar{\rho}] \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F})$.

The coefficients $\{N_{\rho,\sigma}^{\tau}\}$ are called the **fusion coefficients**. They are the structure constants of the associated fusion ring $\mathbb{Z}\,\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F})$, see below.

The dimension function $[\rho] \mapsto d\rho$ coincides with the unique positive character $d\colon \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F}) \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ on the fusion ring, see Lemma 2.12. The complex vector space $\mathbb{C}\,\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F})$ has a normalized trace $\mathrm{tr}([\rho]) = \delta_{[\rho],[\mathrm{id}_M]}$ and is a finite dimensional C*-algebra and therefore isomorphic to a multi-matrix algebra $\bigoplus_i M_{d_i}(\mathbb{C})$.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a unitary braided fusion category, i.e. there is a natural family of unitaries $\{\varepsilon(\rho, \sigma) \in \mathrm{Hom}(\rho, \sigma)\}$ fulfilling the usual definition of a braiding.

The **Müger centralizer** $C_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}' \cap \mathcal{C}$ of a full subcategory $\mathcal{F}$ of a unitary braied fusion category $\mathcal{C}$ is defined to be the full subcategory

$$C_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\rho \in \mathcal{C} : \varepsilon(\rho, \sigma)\varepsilon(\sigma, \rho) = 1_{\sigma \otimes \rho} \text{ for all } \sigma \in \mathcal{F}\}\,.$$

We call $\mathcal{C}$ a **unitary modular tensor category (UMTC)** if the **Müger center** $\mathcal{C}' \cap \mathcal{C}$ is trivial, i.e. $C_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C}) \cong \mathrm{Vect}$. Further, if $\mathcal{D}$ is UMTC which is a full subcategory of a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$, then $\mathcal{C}$ is braided equivalent to $\mathcal{D} \boxtimes C_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{D})$ by [Müg03c, Theorem 4.2].

2.2. **Subfactors in Unitary Fusion Categories.** We give a short background to subfactors related to a given unitary fusion category. We refer to [BKL15, BKLR15]. Let us assume that ${}_N\mathcal{F}_N \subset \mathrm{End}(N)$ is a unitary fusion category. We can consider a subfactor $\iota(N) \subset M$, with finite index. Then there is a dual homorphism $\bar{\iota}\colon M \to N$. We from now on ask that an overfactor

$N \subset M$ fulfills $\bar{\iota} \circ \iota \in {}_N\mathcal{C}_N$. We get isometries $w\colon \mathrm{id}_N \to \bar{\iota} \circ \iota$ and $v\colon \mathrm{id}_M \to \iota \circ \bar{\iota}$ fulfilling the standard conjugate equation

$$(1_{\bar{\iota}} \otimes v^*)(w \otimes 1_{\bar{\iota}}) \equiv \bar{\iota}(v^*)w = \lambda \cdot 1_{\bar{\iota}} \equiv \lambda \cdot 1_N$$
$$(1_{\iota} \otimes w^*)(v \otimes 1_{\iota}) \equiv \iota(w^*)v = \lambda \cdot 1_{\iota} \equiv \lambda \cdot 1_M$$

where $\lambda = [M : N]^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, where $[M : N]$ is the minimal index.

A triple $\Theta = (\theta, w, x)$ with $\theta \in \mathrm{End}(N)$ and isometries $w\colon \mathrm{id}_N \to \theta$ and $x\colon \theta \to \theta^2$, which we will graphically display as

$\sqrt[4]{d\theta}\, w =$ $\qquad\qquad \sqrt[4]{d\theta}\, x =$ 

is called a **Q-system** (cf. [Lon94, LR97]) if it fulfills

$$xx = \theta(x)x \qquad (x \otimes 1_\theta)x = (1_\theta \otimes x)x \qquad \text{(associativity)}$$
$$w^*x = \theta(w^*)x = \lambda 1_\theta \qquad (w^* \otimes 1_\theta)x = (1_\theta \otimes w^*)x = \lambda 1_\theta \qquad \text{(unit law)}$$

where $\lambda = \sqrt{d\theta}^{-1}$. In graphical notation this reads:

Overfactors $M \supset N$ with $\bar{\iota} \circ \iota \in {}_N\mathcal{F}_N$ up to conjugation are in one-to-one correspondence with simple equivalence classes of Q-systems (θ, v, x) in ${}_N\mathcal{F}_N$. The Q-system is given by $\theta = \bar{\iota} \circ \iota$, w and $x := (1_{\bar{\iota}} \otimes v \otimes 1_\iota) = \bar{\iota}(v) \in \mathrm{Hom}(\theta, \theta \circ \theta)$. The subfactor $N \subset M$ is called **irreducible** if $\iota(N)' \cap M = \mathbb{C} \cdot 1_M$, which is equivalent with $\dim \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}_N, \theta) = 1$. We call such a Q-system irreducible or connected. If not otherwise specified we mean by a Q-system a connected Q-system. We note that connected Q-systems are automatically simple. We denote by ${}_M\mathcal{C}_M$ the unitary fusion category generated by $\beta \prec \iota \circ \rho \circ \bar{\iota}$. In this case we say, that ${}_N\mathcal{C}_N$ an ${}_M\mathcal{C}_M$ are Morita equivalent, which correspond to weak monoidal equivalence, see [Müg03a].

We are often interested in the case that ${}_N\mathcal{C}_N$ is a UMTC and $N \subset M$ coming from a commutative Q-system in ${}_N\mathcal{C}_N$. Then a Q-system is called **commutative** if $\varepsilon(\theta, \theta)x = x$, diagramatically:



Let $\iota(N) \subset M$ associated to Q-system in ${}_N\mathcal{C}_N$ For $\rho \in {}_N\mathcal{C}_N$ we define its **α-induction** by

$$\alpha^{\pm}_\rho = \bar{\iota}^{-1} \circ \mathrm{Ad}(\varepsilon^{\pm}(\rho, \theta)) \circ \lambda \circ \bar{\iota} \in \mathrm{End}(M)\,.$$

It turns out that $\alpha^{\pm}\colon {}_N\mathcal{C}_N \to {}_M\mathcal{C}_M$. We denote by ${}_M\mathcal{C}^{\pm}_M = \langle \alpha^+(\rho) : \rho \in {}_N\mathcal{C}_N \}$ the unitary fusion category generated by $\alpha^{\pm}$-induction, respectively. Because ${}_N\mathcal{C}_N$ is a UMTC it follows that ${}_M\mathcal{C}^+_M \cup {}_M\mathcal{C}^-_M$ generates ${}_M\mathcal{C}_M$. We denote by ${}_M\mathcal{C}^0_M = {}_M\mathcal{C}^+_M \cap {}_M\mathcal{C}^-_M$ the **ambichiral** category.

2.3. **The Drinfel'd center.** The (unitary) **Drinfel'd center** or **quantum double** $Z({}_N\mathcal{F}_N)$ is the category with objects $(\sigma, \varepsilon_\sigma)$, where $\sigma \in {}_N\mathcal{F}_N$ and a (unitary) **half-braiding** $\varepsilon_\sigma = \{\varepsilon_\sigma(\rho)\}_{\rho \in {}_N\mathcal{F}_N}$, i.e. a family of unitaries $\varepsilon_\sigma(\rho) \in \mathrm{Hom}(\sigma\rho, \rho\sigma)$, such that for every $t \in \mathrm{Hom}(\rho, \tau)$

$$(t \otimes 1_\sigma) \cdot \varepsilon_\sigma(\rho) = \varepsilon_\sigma(\tau) \cdot (1_\sigma \otimes t)$$

and

$$\varepsilon_\sigma(\rho\tau) = (1_\rho \otimes \varepsilon_\sigma(\tau)) \cdot \varepsilon_\sigma(\rho)\,.$$

We introduce the following intuitive graphical notation for half-braidings:

$\varepsilon_\sigma(\tau) =$

.

The hooks at the end of the braiding symbolizes that the naturality in σ does a priori not hold. Using this notations, the conditions on a half-brading reads as:



,



.

The morphisms are given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Hom}((\rho, \varepsilon_\rho), (\sigma, \varepsilon_\sigma)) \\
&\quad = \{t \in \mathrm{Hom}(\rho, \sigma) : (1_\tau \otimes t) \cdot \varepsilon_\rho(\tau) = \varepsilon_\sigma(\tau) \cdot (t \otimes 1_\tau) \text{ for all } \tau \in {}_N\mathcal{C}_N\} \\
&\quad = \left\{ t \in \mathrm{Hom}(\rho, \sigma) : \right.
\end{aligned}$$


$\left.\text{ for all } \tau \in {}_N\mathcal{F}_N \right\}$.

and the tensor product by

$$(\rho, \varepsilon_\rho) \otimes (\sigma, \varepsilon_\sigma) = (\rho\sigma, (\varepsilon_\rho(\,\cdot\,) \otimes 1_\sigma) \cdot (1_\rho \otimes \varepsilon_\sigma(\,\cdot\,)))\,,$$



.

The tensor product of morphisms is the usual one. Namely, it is easy to check that if $s \in \mathrm{Hom}((\sigma, \varepsilon_\sigma), (\sigma', \varepsilon_{\sigma'}))$ and $t \in \mathrm{Hom}((\tau, \varepsilon_\tau), (\tau', \varepsilon_{\tau'}))$ then

$$t \otimes s \in \mathrm{Hom}((\sigma, \varepsilon_\sigma) \otimes (\tau, \varepsilon_\tau), (\sigma', \varepsilon_{\sigma'}) \otimes (\tau', \varepsilon_{\tau'})) \equiv \mathrm{Hom}((\sigma\tau, \varepsilon_\sigma\sigma(\varepsilon_\tau(\,\cdot\,))), (\sigma'\tau', \varepsilon_{\sigma'}\sigma'(\varepsilon_{\tau'}(\,\cdot\,))))\,.$$

Note that this is again a strict tensor category and it is braided, with the braiding given as:



where $S = (\sigma, \varepsilon_\sigma)$ and $T = (\tau, \varepsilon_\tau)$.

2.4. **Longo–Rehren Subfactors and Drinfel'd center.** Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a unitary fusion category (UFC). We may assume that $\mathcal{F} = {}_N\mathcal{F}_N \subset \mathrm{End}(N)$ for N a hyperfinite type III_1 factor. For example, $\mathcal{F}$ might be the even part $\mathcal{F} = \langle \bar{\iota}\iota \rangle$ of a finite index, finite depth subfactor $\iota(N) \subset M$.

Starting from this data we can build the Longo–Rehren inclusion [LR95] as follows. Let $B = N \otimes N^{\mathrm{op}}$ and let $j\colon N \to N^{\mathrm{op}}$ be an anti-linear isomorphism. For $\beta \in \mathrm{End}_0(N)$ we define $\beta^{\mathrm{op}} = j \circ \beta \circ j^{-1} \in \mathrm{End}_0(N^{\mathrm{op}})$. We denote by ${}_B\mathcal{G}_B$ the unitary fusion category $\langle \rho \otimes \sigma^{\mathrm{op}} : \rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{F} \rangle \subset \mathrm{End}_0(B)$, see [LR95, Izu00]. This means, we have ${}_B\mathcal{G}_B \cong \mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{op}}$. There is a Q-system $(\gamma, v \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}_B, \gamma), z \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma\gamma))$ inside ${}_B\mathcal{G}_B$ given by [LR95, Izu00]:

$$\gamma = \sum \mathrm{Ad}\, v_i \circ (\rho_i \otimes \rho_i^{\mathrm{op}})\,, \qquad v = v_0\,, \qquad z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathrm{Dim}\,\mathcal{F}}} \bigoplus_{ijk} \sum_{t \in \mathrm{B}(\rho_i, \rho_j\rho_k)} \sqrt{\frac{d\rho_i d\rho_j}{d\rho_k}}\, t \otimes j(t)\,,$$

where $\{v_i\}$ are generators of $\mathcal{O}_{n+1}$ and $\mathrm{B}(\rho_i, \rho_j\rho_k)$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathrm{Hom}(\rho_i, \rho_j\rho_k)$. We get a subfactor $A = E(B) \subset B$, where $E(\,\cdot\,) = z^*\gamma(\,\cdot\,)z$ is the conditional expectation associated with Γ. We denote by $\iota\colon A \to B$ the canonical inclusion, then there is a dual $\bar{\iota}\colon B \to A$, such that $\gamma = \iota\bar{\iota}$, name $\bar{\iota}$ coincides with γ seen as a map $B \to A$. Let ${}_A\mathcal{G}_A$ be the unitary fusion category $\langle \bar{\iota}(\rho \otimes \sigma^{\mathrm{op}})\iota : \rho, \sigma \in \mathcal{F} \rangle \subset \mathrm{End}_0(A)$. By [Izu00, Müg03b] we get an equivalence of unitary fusion categories $\eta\colon Z(\mathcal{F}) \to {}_A\mathcal{G}_A$, in particular ${}_A\mathcal{G}_A$ has a non-degenerate braiding and therefore possesses the structure of a UMTC. The dual Q-system $\Theta = (\theta = \bar{\iota}\iota, w, x = \bar{\iota}(v))$ is a commutative Q-system in ${}_A\mathcal{G}_A$. Since $(d\theta)^2 = (d\gamma)^2 = (\mathrm{Dim}\,\mathcal{F})^2 = \mathrm{Dim}({}_A\mathcal{G}_A)$ it is a Lagrangian Q-system, which is defined as follows.

Definition 2.1. We call an irreducible commutative Q-system $\Theta = (\theta, x, w)$ in a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$ **Lagrangian** if $(\dim\theta)^2 = \mathrm{Dim}\,\mathcal{C}$.

We remark that $[\alpha^+_{\eta(\beta,\varepsilon_\beta)}] = [\beta \otimes \mathrm{id}]$ by [Izu00, Corollary 6.3].

Proposition 2.2. *Let ${}_A\mathcal{G}_A \cong Z(\mathcal{G})$ be the unitary modular tensor category from above. Then the category generated by α^+–induction ${}_B\mathcal{G}^+_B = \langle \alpha^+_\rho : \rho \in {}_A\mathcal{G}_A \rangle$ coincides with $\langle \beta \otimes \mathrm{id} : \beta \in \mathcal{F} \rangle \cong \mathcal{F}$.*

2.5. **Hypergroups and Fusion Rings.** We introduce the notion of a hypergroup. The reason is that we need a generalization of a fusion ring, where the coefficients are not necessarily integral. A fusion ring gives "up to a different normalization" a hypergroup. The converse is in general not true. The normalization of the hypergroup has a more probabilistic nature, while the fusion ring has more of a categorical or representation theoretical nature.

Definition 2.3. A (finite) hypergroup is a set $K = \{c_0, \ldots, c_n\}$ with an evolution $c_i \mapsto c_{\bar{i}}$ and a structure of an associative unital $*$-algebra structure on $\mathbb{C}K$:

$$c_i c_j = \sum_k C_{ij}^k c_k\,, \qquad\qquad c_k^* = c_{\bar{k}}\,, \qquad\qquad c_0^* = c_0\,,$$

with unit c_0, such that

(1) $C_{ij}^k \geq 0$,
(2) $\sum_k C_{ij}^k = 1$ for all i, j, and

(3) $C_{ij}^0 = C_{ji}^0$ and $C_{ij}^0 > 0$ iff $j = \bar{i}$.

The condition $C_{ij}^0 = C_{ji}^0$ turns out to be automatic [SW03]. We note that $\mathbb{C}K := \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}(K)$ is a C*-algebra with normalized trace defined by $\mathrm{tr}(c_k) = \delta_{k,0}$.

Definition 2.4. A **Haar element** is an element $e \in \mathrm{Conv}(K)$, such that $e^* = e = e^2$ and $c_k e = e c_k = e$ for all $c_k \in K$.

We define the **weight** of an element $c_i \in K$ to be $w_i = (C_{i\bar{i}}^0)^{-1}$ and the **weight** $D(K)$ **of the hypergroup** K to be $D(K) = \sum_k w_k$. Then it follows that $w_i = w_{\bar{i}}$.

Lemma 2.5. *We have*

$$C_{ij}^k = \frac{w_k}{w_i} C_{k\bar{j}}^i = \frac{w_k}{w_j} C_{\bar{i}k}^j = \frac{w_k}{w_i} C_{j\bar{k}}^{\bar{i}} .$$

Proof. The first equation follows from comparing the c_0 coefficients of $(c_i c_j)c_{\bar{k}} = w_k^{-1} C_{ij}^k c_0 + \cdots$ and $(c_i c_j c_{\bar{k}})^* = (c_k c_{\bar{j}})c_{\bar{i}} = w_i^{-1} C_{k\bar{j}}^i c_0 + \cdots$. The other equations are derived analogously. □

Proposition 2.6. *The convex sum*

$$e_K = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{c_k \in K} w_k c_k$$

defines a Haar element on K.

Proof. Self-adjointness $e_K^* = e_K$ follows immediately. Further, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
e_K c_\ell &= \frac{1}{D} \sum_k w_k c_k c_\ell = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{k,m} w_k C_{k\ell}^m c_m = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{k,m} w_m C_{m\bar{\ell}}^k c_m = \frac{1}{D} \sum_m w_m c_m = e_K , \\
c_\ell e_K &= \frac{1}{D} \sum_k w_k c_\ell c_k = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{k,m} w_k C_{\ell k}^m c_m = \frac{1}{D} \sum_{k,m} w_m C_{m\bar{k}}^\ell c_m = \frac{1}{D} \sum_m w_m [m] = e_K , \\
e_K^2 &= \frac{1}{D^2} \sum_{k,\ell} w_k w_\ell c_k c_\ell = \frac{1}{D^2} \sum_{k,\ell,m} w_k w_\ell C_{k\ell}^m c_m = \frac{1}{D^2} \sum_{k,\ell,m} w_m w_\ell C_{m\bar{\ell}}^k c_m \\
&= \frac{1}{D^2} \sum_{\ell,m} w_m w_\ell c_m = \frac{1}{D} \sum_m w_m w_\ell c_m = e_K .
\end{aligned}$$

□

Example 2.7. Let G be a finite group, then it is a hypergroup with $\bar{g} = g^{-1}$. In this case the Haar element is $e_G = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} g$ and corresponds to the average with respect to the Haar measure.

Definition 2.8. A **fusion ring (basis)** is a set $F = \{[0], \ldots, [n]\}$ with an evolution $[i] \mapsto [\bar{i}]$ and a structure of an associative unital $*$-algebra structure on $\mathbb{C}F$:

$$[i][j] = \sum_k N_{ij}^k [k] , \qquad [i]^* = [\bar{i}] ,$$

with $[0]$ the unit, such that

(1) $N_{ij}^k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and
(2) $N_{ij}^0 = \delta_{j,\bar{i}}$.

With this definition the ring $\mathbb{Z}F$ is a based ring [EGNO15, 3.1] which is a fusion ring. We drop the word basis if it is clear what we are talking about.

Lemma 2.9. *Let F be a fusion ring, then we have* ***Frobenius reciprocity****, i.e.*

$$N_{ij}^k = N_{k\bar{j}}^i = N_{\bar{i}k}^j = N_{j\bar{k}}^{\bar{i}} = N_{\bar{k}i}^{\bar{j}} .$$

Proof. As in Lemma 2.5, or by noting that we get a hypergroup (see below). □

Definition 2.10. If $\mathcal{F}$ is a unitary fusion category, then $F = \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F})$ is a fusion ring with product

$$[\rho] \otimes [\sigma] = \bigoplus_{\tau \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F})} N_{\rho,\sigma}^{\tau}[\tau], \qquad N_{\rho,\sigma}^{\tau} = \dim \mathrm{Hom}(\rho \otimes \sigma, \tau)$$

and $[\sigma]^* = [\bar{\sigma}]$. In this case we say $\mathcal{F}$ is a **categorification** of F. If a fusion ring F has a categorification, we say it is **categorifiable**.

Usually, unitarity is not assumed, but in this paper we deal with operator algebras which naturally give unitary fusion categories. It is widely open problem which fusion rings are categorifiable. The following is a classical result.

Example 2.11. If G is a finite group, then the categorifications are in one-to-one correspondence with elements in $H^3(G, \mathsf{U}(1))$ (see e.g. [FRS04]). We note that in operator algebraic terms, the categorifcation is given by $\langle \alpha_g : g \in G \rangle \subset \mathrm{End}(M)$, where $\alpha \colon G \to \mathrm{Out}(M)$ is a G**-kernel** [Con77, Jon80] and M a (hyperfinite) type III_1 (or originally II_1) factor.

The following is an application of Perron–Frobenius theory.

Lemma 2.12 ([Sun92, 10. Theorem])**.** *There is a unique positive character $K \ni k \mapsto d_k$, such that $d_0 = 1$. It holds $d_{\bar{i}} = d_i$ and $d_i \geq 1$.*

Proposition 2.13. *A fusion ring basis F is naturally a hypergroup K_F by choosing $c_i = d_i^{-1}[i] \in \mathbb{C}F$, and $K_F = \{c_0, \ldots, c_n\}$ with:*

$$C_{ij}^k = \frac{d_k}{d_i d_j} N_{ij}^k \,, \qquad w_i = d_i^2 \,.$$

A hypergroup K comes from a fusion ring if and only if:

$$\sqrt{\frac{w_i w_j}{w_k}} C_{ij}^k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \qquad \text{for all } i, j, k \in K \,.$$

We define the analogous as for the hypergroup:

$$D(F) = \sum_{k \in F} d_k^2 \,, \qquad e_F = \frac{1}{D(F)} \sum_{k \in F} d_k [k] \,.$$

Here $D(F)$ is called the **global dimension** of F which coincides with the weight $D(K_F)$ of the associated hypergroup K_F. It follows that e_F is the Haar element of the hypergroup. If $\mathcal{F}$ is a fusion category we denote the associated hypergroup by $K_{\mathcal{F}}$.

2.6. **Subhypergroups and Quotients.**

Definition 2.14. A subhypergroup $L \subset K$, written $L \leq K$ is a subset $L \subset K$, such that $\mathbb{C}L$ is a unital $*$-subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}K$, i.e. $c_0 \in L$, $LL \subset \mathbb{C}L$ (then $\mathbb{C}LL = \mathbb{C}L$) and $L^* = L$.

For $x, y \in \mathrm{Conv}(K)$, we write $x \prec y$ if there is a $0 < \lambda \leq 1$ and a $z \in \mathrm{Conv}(K)$, such that $y = \lambda x + (1 - \lambda) z$. We write $\mathrm{supp}(x) = \{c_k \in K : c_k \prec x\}$.

Definition 2.15. Let L, M be subhypergroups of K. We define the "set of (L, M)-double cosets" to be $L \backslash K / M = \{e_L c_k e_M : c_k \in K\}$, where $e_{L,M}$ is the Haar element associated with the corresponding subhypergroup. We write $K // L = L \backslash K / L$.

The following is well-known see e.g. [BH95] for the case of compact hypergroups.

Proposition 2.16. *The double cosets $K // L$ form a hypergroup.*

Proof. Since e_L is a projection $\mathbb{C}[K//L] = e_L\mathbb{C}Ke_L$ is a $*$-algebra with identity e_L.

For $(e_Lc_ke_L), (e_Lc_le_L) \in K//L$, we have $(e_Lc_ke_L)(e_Lc_le_L) = e_L(c_ke_Lc_l)e_L = \sum_{[m]} \tilde{C}^{[m]}_{[k],[l]}(e_Lc_me_L)$ with $\tilde{C}^{[m]}_{[k],[l]} \geq 0$, where $[m]$ is the equivalence class $\{k : e_Lc_me_L = e_Lc_ke_L\}$. Since $e_Lc_ke_L \in \mathrm{Conv}(K)$ by applying the trivial representation $c_k \mapsto 1$, we get that $\sum_{[m]} \tilde{C}^{[m]}_{[k],[l]} = 1$.

Since $e_L \prec e_Lc_kc_{\bar{k}} \prec e_Lc_ke_Lc_{\bar{k}}e_L$, we have that $(e_Lc_ke_L)(e_Lc_ke_L)^*$ contains the identity. Conversely, let us assume that $e_L \prec e_Lc_ke_Lc_le_L = (e_Lc_ke_L)(e_Lc_le_L)$, then by [BH95, 1.5.14 Proposition] it follows that $e_Lc_ke_L = e_Lc_le_L$. □

A map $\phi\colon K \to L$ is a morphism if it extends to a $*$-homomorphism $\mathbb{C}K \to \mathbb{C}L$. We define $\ker(\phi) = \{c_k \in K : \phi(c_k) = c_0\}$ and $\mathrm{Im}(\phi) = \phi(K)$, which are subhypergroups of K and L, respectively. With this notion we have a short exact sequence

$$\{c_0\} \longrightarrow L \xrightarrow{\quad\iota\quad} K \xrightarrow{\quad e_L \,\cdot\, e_L\quad} K//L \longrightarrow \{\tilde{c}_0 \equiv e_L\}\,.$$

Definition 2.17. $K = \bigcup_{g\in G} K_g$ is a **grading** of a hypergroup K by a finite group G, if $c_i \in K_g$ and $c_j \in K_h$ implies $c_ic_j \in \mathrm{Conv}(K_{gh})$. The grading is **faithful** if K_g is non-empty for all $g \in G_K$.

If K is graded by G, then $\mathbb{C}K = \bigoplus_{g\in G} \mathbb{C}K_g$ is a graded algebra. The **adjoint subhypergroup** K_{ad} of K is defined by $K_{\mathrm{ad}} = \{c_l \in K : c_l \prec c_kc_{\bar{k}} \text{ for some } c_k \in K\}$. It follows that $G_K = K//K_{\mathrm{ad}}$ is a group, which we call the **universal grading group** of K (cf. [EGNO15, Corollary 3.6.6]) and that $K_g = \{c_k \in K : e_{K_{\mathrm{ad}}}c_ke_{K_{\mathrm{ad}}} = g\}$ is a faithful grading with $K_e = K_{\mathrm{ad}}$. This grading is universal in the following sense: If $K = \bigcup_{g\in G} \tilde{K}_g$, is another faithful grading then there is a surjective group homomorphism $a\colon G_K \to G$ with $\tilde{K}_g = \bigcup_{h\in a^{-1}(g)} K_h$. The proofs are the same as for based rings, see e.g. [EGNO15, Section 3.6]. Note, if K is actually a group, then $G_{\mathrm{ad}} = \{c_0\}$ and $G_K = K$. Further, K has a non-trivial faithful gradings if and only if $K_{\mathrm{ad}} \neq K$.

2.7. **Conformal Nets.** We denote by $\mathsf{M\ddot{o}b}$ the group of Möbius transformations of the circle $\mathbb{S}^1$, which can be identified with $\mathsf{PSU}(1,1)$. By a conformal net $\mathcal{A}$ we mean a local Möbius covariant net on the circle, i.e. a map $\mathcal{I} \ni I \mapsto \mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ from the set $\mathcal{I}$ of proper intervals $I \subset \mathbb{S}^1 \subset \mathbb{C}$ on the circle to von Neumann algebras on a fixed separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}}$, such that the following properties hold:

A. Isotony. $I_1 \subset I_2$ implies $\mathcal{A}(I_1) \subset \mathcal{A}(I_2)$.
B. Locality. $I_1 \cap I_2 = \emptyset$ implies $[\mathcal{A}(I_1), \mathcal{A}(I_2)] = \{0\}$.
C. Möbius covariance. There is a strongly continuous unitary representation U of $\mathsf{M\ddot{o}b}$ on $\mathcal{H}$, such that $U(g)\mathcal{A}(I)U(g)^* = \mathcal{A}(gI)$.
D. Positivity of energy. U is a positive energy representation, i.e. the generator L_0 (conformal Hamiltonian) of the rotation subgroup $U(z \mapsto \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\theta}z) = \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\theta L_0}$ has positive spectrum.
E. Vacuum. There is a (up to phase) unique rotation invariant unit vector $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$, which is cyclic for the von Neumann algebra $\mathcal{A} := \bigvee_{I\in\mathcal{I}} \mathcal{A}(I)$.

By the Reeh–Schlieder property [FJ96] the vector Ω is cyclic and separating for every $\mathcal{A}(I)$. The **Bisognano–Wichmann property** holds [GF93, BGL93]. It states that for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$, there is a one-parameter subgroup $\{\delta_I(t)\}_{t\in\mathbb{R}} \subset \mathsf{M\ddot{o}b}$ which fixes the endpoints of I, such that

$$\Delta_{(\mathcal{A}(I),\Omega)} = U(\delta_I(-2\pi t))\,, \qquad\qquad J = U(r_I)\,,$$

are the Tomita–Takesaki modular objects associated with $(\mathcal{A}(I), \Omega)$. Here $U(r_I)$ is an anti-unitary representing the reflection along the interval I which extends U to an (anti-) unitary representation of $\mathsf{M\ddot{o}b} \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2$. This implies **Haag-duality**, i.e. $\mathcal{A}(I)' = \mathcal{A}(I')$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$, where $I' = \mathbb{S}^1 \setminus \overline{I}$. The uniqueness of the vacuum implies that $\mathcal{A}(I)$ is either $\mathbb{C}$ or a type III_1 factor in Connes classification [Con73].

A local Möbius covariant net on $\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathbb{S}^1$ is called **completely rational** if it

F. fulfills the **split property**, i.e. for $I_0, I \in \mathcal{I}$ with $\overline{I_0} \subset I$ the inclusion $\mathcal{A}(I_0) \subset \mathcal{A}(I)$ is a split inclusion, namely there exists an intermediate type I factor M, such that $\mathcal{A}(I_0) \subset M \subset \mathcal{A}(I)$.

G. is **strongly additive**, i.e. for $I_1, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}$ two adjacent intervals obtained by removing a single point from an interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$ the equality $\mathcal{A}(I_1) \vee \mathcal{A}(I_2) = \mathcal{A}(I)$ holds.

H. for $I_1, I_3 \in \mathcal{I}$ two intervals with disjoint closure and $I_2, I_4 \in \mathcal{I}$ the two components of $(I_1 \cup I_3)'$, the **μ-index** of $\mathcal{A}$

$$\mu(\mathcal{A}) := [(\mathcal{A}(I_2) \vee \mathcal{A}(I_4))' : \mathcal{A}(I_1) \vee \mathcal{A}(I_3)]$$

(which does not depend on the intervals I_i) is finite.

The split property implies that each $\mathcal{A}(I)$ is isomorphic to the unique (by [Haa87]) hyperfinite type III_1 factor.

A **representation** π of $\mathcal{A}$ is a family of representations $\pi = \{\pi_I \colon \mathcal{A}(I) \to \mathrm{B}(\mathcal{H}_\pi)\}_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ on a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\pi$. The family is asked to be **compatible**, i.e. $\pi_J \restriction \mathcal{A}(I) = \pi_I$ for $I \subset J$. Every representation π turns out (for any choice of an interval $I_0 \in \mathcal{I}$) to be equivalent to a representation ρ on $\mathcal{H}$ which is "localized in I_0", i.e. $\rho_J = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}(J)}$ for $J \cap I_0 = \emptyset$. Then Haag duality implies that ρ_I is an endomorphism of $\mathcal{A}(I)$ for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$ with $I \supset I_0$. The **statistical dimension** of $\rho \in \mathrm{Rep}^I(\mathcal{A})$ is given by $d\rho = [\mathcal{A}(I) : \rho(\mathcal{A}(I))]^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Thus we can realize the category of in I localized representations of $\mathcal{A}$ with finite statistical dimension inside the C*-tensor category of endomorphisms $\mathrm{End}_0(A)$ of a type III factor $A = \mathcal{A}(I)$ and the embedding turns out to be full and replete. We denote this category by $\mathrm{Rep}^I(\mathcal{A})$. In particular, this gives the representations of $\mathcal{A}$ the structure of a tensor category [DHR71]. It has a natural **braiding**, which is completely fixed by asking that if ρ is localized in I_1 and σ in I_2 where I_1 is left of I_2 inside I then $\varepsilon(\rho, \sigma) = 1$ [FRS89]. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a completely rational conformal net, then by [KLM01] every representation is reducible and every irreducible representation has finite statistical dimension. Again by [KLM01] $\mathrm{Rep}^I(\mathcal{A})$ is a UMTC and the μ-index $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}$ coincides with the global dimension $\mathrm{Dim}(\mathrm{Rep}^I(\mathcal{A}))$. We note that if $\mathcal{A}$ is strongly additive than every representation with finite statistical dimension is covariant [GL92].

Given a net $\mathcal{B}$ and an assignment $\mathcal{I} \ni I \mapsto \mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ for all $I \subset \mathcal{I}$, which satisfies isotony and such that $U(g)\mathcal{A}(I)U(g)^* = \mathcal{A}(gI)$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $g \in \mathsf{M\ddot{o}b}$ is called a **subnet** $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{B}$. Let e be the projection onto $\overline{\mathcal{A}(I)\Omega}$ which by the Reeh-Schlieder property is independent of I, then $e\mathcal{A}(I)$ is a conformal net on $e\mathcal{H}$, which by abuse of notation we also denote by $\mathcal{A}$. We write $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$. More general, given two independent conformal nets $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ we write $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ or $\mathcal{B} \supset \mathcal{A}$ if there is a representation $\pi = \{\pi_I \colon \mathcal{A}(I) \to \mathcal{B}(I) \subset \mathrm{B}(\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{B})\}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{B}$ and an isometry $V \colon \mathcal{H}_\mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{H}_\mathcal{B}$ with $V\Omega_\mathcal{A} = \Omega_\mathcal{B}$ and $VU_\mathcal{A}(g) = U_\mathcal{B}(g)V$ and $Va = \pi_I(a)V$ for $I \in \mathcal{I}$, $a \in \mathcal{A}(I)$. Define p the projection onto $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_0} = \overline{\pi_I(\mathcal{A}(I))\Omega}$. Then pV is a unitary equivalence of the nets $\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathcal{H}_\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}_0$ defined by $\mathcal{A}_0(I) = \pi_I(\mathcal{A}(I))p$ on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{A}_0}$. Here $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a subnet of $\mathcal{B}$ in the sense above.

3. Hypergroup Actions on Conformal Nets

We define actions of a hypergroup on a von Neumann algebras. Having the applications of actions on a conformal net in mind, we just concentrate on a very special case.

3.1. **Hypergroup actions on non-commutative probability spaces.** Given (M, Ω) a von Neumann algebra $M \subset \mathrm{B}(\mathcal{H})$ with a cyclic and separating vector $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$ let us denote by $\mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(M)$ the set of all Ω-preserving stochastic maps $M \to M$, i.e. normal unital completely positive maps $\phi \colon M \to M$, such that $(\Omega, \phi(\,\cdot\,)\Omega) = (\Omega,\ \cdot\ \Omega)$, see Appendix A. We say a map $\phi \in \mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(M)$ is **extremal** or **pure** if it cannot be written as a non-trivial convex combination of stochastic maps, i.e. $\phi = \lambda\phi_1 + (1-\lambda)\phi_2$ with $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(M)$ and $\lambda \in (0,1)$ implies $\phi_1 = \phi_2 = \phi$.

Definition 3.1. Let K be a hypergroup with structure constants $(C_{ij}^k)_{i,j,k \in K}$. A **(normal) Ω-preserving action** of K on (M, Ω) is a map $\phi \colon K \to \mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(M)$, $k \mapsto \phi_k$, s.t. for all $i, j \in K$:

(1) $\phi_i \circ \phi_j = \sum_{k \in K} C_{ij}^k \phi_k$ and $\phi_0 = \mathrm{id}_M$.

(2) $\phi_{\bar{i}}$ is an Ω-adjoint $\phi_i^\sharp$ of $\phi_{\bar{i}}$.
(3) ϕ_i is extremal in $\mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(M)$

We say it is **faithful** if $\{\phi_k\}_{0\leq k\leq n}$ are affine independent, i.e. $\{\phi_k - \mathrm{id}_M\}_{1\leq k\leq 0}$ are linearly independent.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\phi\colon K \to \mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(M)$ be a (normal) Ω-preserving action of K on (M,Ω). Then the following are equivalent.*

(1) The action ϕ is faithful and
(2) $\phi_k = \phi_0$ implies $k = 0$.

Proof. If $\phi_k = \phi_0$ for some $k \neq 0$, then the action is not faithful. Conversely, let us assume that the action is not faithful. i.e. there is a convex combination $\sum \lambda_{i=1}^n \phi_i = \phi_0$ with $\lambda_k > 0$ for some k. Then $\phi_{\bar{k}} = \phi_{\bar{k}} \left(\sum \lambda_{i=1}^n \phi_i\right) = \lambda_k w_k \phi_0 + \cdots$ and because $\phi_{\bar{k}}$ is pure it follows that $\phi_{\bar{k}} = \phi_0$. □

We can extend ϕ to an affine map $\phi\colon \mathrm{Conv}(K) \to \mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(M)$ and a linear map $\phi\colon \mathbb{C}K \to \mathrm{Maps}(M)$ by $\phi(\sum_k \lambda_k c_k) = \lambda_k \phi_k$. From the Haar element $e_K \in \mathrm{Conv}(K)$ we get a Ω-preserving stochastic map which is an idempotent

$$E = \phi(e_K) \equiv \frac{1}{D(K)} \sum_{k\in K} w_k \phi_k \,.$$

For $k \in K$ we define operators $V_k \in \mathrm{B}(\mathcal{H})$ by

$$V_k\colon a\Omega \mapsto \phi_k(a)\Omega \,, \qquad\qquad (a \in M)$$

which are contractions by the Kadison–Schwarz inequality (5). This gives a representation of K which can linearly be extended to a $*$-representation $V\colon \mathbb{C}K \to \mathrm{B}(\mathcal{H})$, namely

$$(a\Omega, V_{\bar{k}} b\Omega) = (a\Omega, \phi_{\bar{k}}(b)\Omega) = (a\Omega, \phi_k^\sharp(b)\Omega) = (\phi_k(a)\Omega, b\Omega) = (V_k a\Omega, b\Omega) = (a\Omega, V_k^* b\Omega) \,.$$

Proposition 3.3. *The following subsets of M are equal:*

(1) $\{m \in M : \phi_k(m) = m$ for all $k \in K\}$,
(2) $E(M)$,
(3) $M \cap \{e\}'$,
(4) $M \cap V(\mathbb{C}K)'$.

They give a unital von Neumman subalgebra $N \subset M$ with normal conditional expectation $E\colon M \to N \subset M$.

Proof. $N = E(M)$ is a von Neumann algebra with conditional expectation $E\colon M \to N \subset M$ by Proposition A.3.

The inclusion $\{m \in M : \phi_k(m) = m \text{ for all } k \in K\} \subset E(M)$ is trivial. Let $m \in E(M)$. Because E is an idempotent $m = E(m)$ and therefore $\phi_k(m) = \phi_k \circ E(m) = E(m) = m$. Since Ω is separating $M \ni m \mapsto me$ is injective and $exe = E(x)e$ which implies that: $m \in M$ commutes with e if and only if $E(m) = m$ (cf. [JS97]).

We have $M \cap V(\mathbb{C}K)' \subset M \cap \{e\}'$, since $e = V(e_K)$. It remains to show $N := \{m \in M : \phi_k(m) = m$ for all $k \in K\} \subset M \cap V(\mathbb{C}K)'$, i.e. that $N \subset V(\mathbb{C}K)'$. Let $n \in N$. Since E is a conditional expectation onto N we have $E(n^*n) = n^*n$. Then

$$\phi_k(n^*n) = \phi_k(E(n^*n)) = E(n^*n) = n^*n = \phi_k(n)^*\phi_k(n) \,.$$

For all $m \in M$ we have $\phi_k(nm) = \phi_k(n)\phi_k(m) = n\phi_k(m)$ using Theorem A.1 and therefore

$$V_k nm\Omega = \phi_k(nm)\Omega = n\phi_k(m)\Omega = nV_k m\Omega \,.$$

Since Ω is cyclic for M this gives $V_k n = nV_k$ and since k was arbitrary we have $n \in V(\mathbb{C}K)'$. □

We denote the set of Proposition 3.3 by M^K if it is clear which action $K \to \mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(M)$ is meant and call M^K the K-fixed point algebra. In particular, it follows that $e = V(e_K)$ is the Jones projection implementing the conditional expectation E, i.e. $E(\,\cdot\,)e = eE(\,\cdot\,)e$. In a similar fashion, V_k is "implementing" ϕ_k:

Proposition 3.4. *We have $\phi_k(n_1 m n_2) = n_1\phi_k(m)n_2$ for all $n_1, n_2 \in M^K$ and $m \in M$ and $\phi_k(m)e = V_k m e$ for all $m \in M$.*

Proof. Using Theorem A.1 as before we get the first statement. For all $m_1, m_2 \in M$ we have:

$$\phi_k(m_1)em_2\Omega = \phi_k(m_1)E(m_2)\Omega = \phi_k(m_1E(m_2))\Omega = V_k m_1 E(m_2)\Omega = V_k m_1 e m_2\Omega$$

and the statement follows because Ω is cyclic for M. □

Remark 3.5. We can recover ϕ_k from V_k as follows. Since $\{m'\Omega : m' \in M'\}$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$, we have that $\phi_k(m)$ with $m \in M$ is the closure of the linear map

$$m'\Omega \mapsto m'V_k m\Omega\,, \qquad\qquad m' \in M'\,.$$

In our application, we have that the centralizer $M^\varphi = \mathbb{C}\cdot 1$ for the state $\varphi = (\Omega,\ \cdot\ \Omega)$ is trivial. This implies that M^K is a factor by the following simple lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Let M be a von Neumann algebra, φ a state on M and $E\colon M \to M$ a state preserving conditional expectation onto N, then $N' \cap N \subset M^\varphi = \{m \in M : \varphi(nm) = \varphi(nm)$ for all $n \in N\}$.*

Proof. Let $n \in N' \cap N$. Then for every $m \in M$ we have $E(nm) = nE(m) = E(m)n = E(mn)$ and thus $\varphi(mn) = \varphi \circ E(mn) = \varphi \circ E(nm) = \varphi(nm)$ thus $n \in M^\varphi$. □

We note that we get that the index is finite with $[M : N] \leq D$. Namely, we have the Pimsner–Popa bound:

$$E(m_+) = \frac{1}{D}\sum_k d_k\phi_k(m_+) \geq \frac{1}{D}\phi_0(m_+) = \frac{1}{D}m_+\,, \qquad\qquad m_+ \in M_+\,.$$

If we have that N is purely infinite factor, then $[M : N] = D$. Namely, in this case we know that the minimal index $[M : N] \equiv \inf\{c \in \mathbb{R} : c \cdot E - \mathrm{id}_M$ is positive$\}$ coincides with $\inf\{c \in \mathbb{R} : c \cdot E - \mathrm{id}_M$ is completely positive$\}$ by [BDH88, Was90]. If we asssume $[M : N] < D$, then there is an $\epsilon > 0$, such that $E - (\frac{1}{D} + \epsilon)\,\mathrm{id}_M = \sum_{k\neq 0}\frac{w_k}{D}\phi_k - \epsilon\,\mathrm{id}_M$ is completely positive. This means $(1 - \epsilon - D^{-1})^{-1}\left(\sum_{k\neq 0}\frac{w_k}{D}\phi_k - \epsilon\,\mathrm{id}_M\right) \in \mathrm{Conv}(\{\phi_0, \ldots, \phi_k\})$, which is a contradiction, since the $\{\phi_0, \ldots, \phi_k\}$ are affine independent.

3.2. **Hypergroup Action on Nets.**

Definition 3.7. Let K be a hypergroup. A **proper hypergroup action** of K on a conformal net $\mathcal{B}$ is a family $\{\phi^I : K \to \mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(\mathcal{B}(I))\}_{I\in\mathcal{I}}$ of faithful Ω-preserving normal hypergroup actions, which is **compatible**, i.e. $\phi_k^J \restriction \mathcal{B}(I) = \phi_k^I$ for all $k \in K$ and all $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ with $I \subset J$.

We observe that a proper hypergroup action is by definition **vacuum preserving**, i.e. $\varphi \circ \phi_k^I = \varphi$ for all $k \in K$ and all $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Here $\varphi(\,\cdot\,) = (\Omega,\ \cdot\ \Omega)$ is the vacuum state.

Let K be a proper hypergroup action on $\mathcal{B}$. As before, we define $V_k \in \mathrm{B}(\mathcal{H})$ by

$$V_k\colon a\Omega \mapsto \phi_k^I(a)\Omega\,, \qquad\qquad a \in \mathcal{B}(I)$$

and note that this is independent of $I \in \mathcal{I}$. This gives a representation of K which extends to a $*$-representation of $\mathbb{C}K$ on $\mathcal{H}$. Further we get conditional expectations $E_I = \phi^I(e_K)$. The conditional expectations are implemented by the Jones projection $e = V(e_K)$. We get that the local algebras have trivial centralizers $\mathcal{B}(I)^\varphi = \mathbb{C}\cdot 1$ for every $I \in \mathcal{I}$ by using covariance and positivity of energy and [Lon79, Proof of Theorem 3]. Therefore by Lemma 3.6 it follows that the subalgebra $\mathcal{B}(I)^K \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ is a subfactor. It turns out that $\{\mathcal{B}(I)^K \subset \mathcal{B}(I)\}_{I\in\mathcal{I}}$ is indeed a conformal subnet.

Theorem 3.8. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a conformal net and let K be a hypergroup acting properly on $\mathcal{B}$.*

(1) Then $I \mapsto \mathcal{B}(I)^K$ is a subnet of $\mathcal{B}$. In particular, $\mathcal{B}^K$ defined by $\mathcal{B}^K(I) := e\mathcal{B}(I)^K$ is a conformal net on $e\mathcal{H}$.
(2) The index is finite and given by $[\mathcal{B}(I) : \mathcal{B}(I)^K] = D(K)$.
(3) If $\mathcal{B}$ is split and strongly additive, then $\mathcal{B}^K$ is split and strongly additive.
(4) If $\mathcal{B}$ is completely rational, then $\mathcal{B}^K$ is completely rational.

Proof. Define $\mathcal{A}(I) = \mathcal{B}(I)^K$, then $\{E_I \colon \mathcal{B}(I) \to \mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)\}$ is a compatible family of vacuum preserving conditional expectations and thus the statement follows from the following Lemma 3.9.

First we observe that $[\mathcal{B}(I) : \mathcal{B}(I)^K] \leq D(K)$. But then $(\mathcal{B}(I)^K)' \cap \mathcal{B}(I) = \mathbb{C}$ by [Lon03, Lemma 14] and $\mathcal{B}(I)^K$ is a factor and therefore $[\mathcal{B}(I) : \mathcal{B}(I)^K] = D(K)$. The last two statements follow from [Lon03, Proposition 34, Theorem 24]. □

Lemma 3.9. *Let $E_I \colon \mathcal{B}(I) \to \mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ be a family of normal compatible and vacuum preserving conditional expectations with image $\mathcal{A}(I) = E_I(\mathcal{B}(I))$. Then $\mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ is a conformal subnet and in particular the projection e onto $\overline{\mathcal{A}(I)\Omega}$ commutes with the Möbius action $U(g)$.*

Proof. The Jones projection $e = e_I$ onto $\overline{\mathcal{A}(I)\Omega}$ does not depend $I \in \mathcal{I}$. Then $\mathcal{A}(I) = \mathcal{B}(I) \cap \{e\}'$. Since E_I preserves $(\Omega, \cdot\, \Omega)$ by Takesaki's theorem [Tak72], [Tak03, Theorem IX.4.2.] we have that $\operatorname{Ad} \Delta^{\mathrm{it}}_{(\mathcal{B}(I),\Omega)}$ leaves $\mathcal{A}(I)$ globally invariant, which is equivalent to $[\Delta^{\mathrm{it}}_{(\mathcal{B}(I),\Omega)}, e] = 0$. Thus by the Bisognano–Wichmann property it follows that e commutes with the dilation $U(\delta_I(t))$ of every interval $I \in \mathcal{I}$. But these generate the Möbius group, thus $[e, U(\,\cdot\,)] = 0$ and $U(g)\mathcal{A}(I)U(g)^* = U(g)\mathcal{B}(I)U(g)^* \cap \{e\}' = \mathcal{B}(gI) \cap \{e\}' = \mathcal{A}(gI)$. Isotony of $\mathcal{A}$ follows from the compatibility, thus $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ is a conformal subnet. □

4. Hypergroup Actions from Subfactors and Conformal Subnets

Let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be a finite index subnet and let $A = \mathcal{A}(I)$ and $B = \mathcal{B}(I)$ for some fixed $I \in \mathcal{I}$. The inclusion is automatically irreducible [Lon03, Lemma 14], i.e. $\mathcal{A}(I)' \cap \mathcal{B}(I) = \mathbb{C}$ for all $I \in \mathcal{I}$. By the Bisognano–Wichmann property and Takesaki's theorem there is a unique ([Lon89, p. 230]) normal conditional expectation $E \colon B \to A$ which is implemented by the projection e_A onto $\overline{A\Omega}$. By the Reeh–Schlieder property [FJ96] $\overline{\mathcal{A}(I)\Omega} = \overline{\mathcal{A}\Omega}$ and in particular the Jones projection $e_{\mathcal{A}} := e_A$ does not depend on I. In particular, there is a unique family of conditional expectations $\{E_I \colon \mathcal{B}(I) \to \mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I) : I \in \mathcal{I}\}$ and the family is compatible, namely $E_J \restriction \mathcal{B}(I) = E_I$ for $I, J \in \mathcal{I}$ with $I \subset J$.

4.1. **Local hypergroup action.** The construction in this section works for a general irreducible (finite depth or just extremal) finite index subfactor $A \subset B$ of type III, with the restriction that the canonical endomorphism γ has no multiplicities.

We denote $\iota \colon A \to B$ the inclusion map, $\bar{\iota} \colon B \to A$ a conjugate and $v \in \operatorname{Hom}(\mathrm{id}, \iota\bar{\iota}) \subset B$ and $w \in \operatorname{Hom}(\mathrm{id}, \bar{\iota}\iota) \subset A$ isometries fulfilling the conjugate equations $\bar{\iota}(v^*)w = \iota(w^*)v = [B : A]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot 1$.

Then $\Gamma = (\gamma = \iota\bar{\iota}, v, \iota(w))$ is a Q-system and the conditional expectation $E \colon B \to \iota(A) \subset B$ is given by the Q-system by $E(\,\cdot\,) = \iota(w)^*\gamma(\,\cdot\,)\iota(w)$ [Lon94].

From now on we will assume that γ has no multicities. By the following proposition, this is true if the dual canonical Q-system $\Theta = (\theta = \iota\bar{\iota}, w, x = \iota(v))$ is commutative.

Proposition 4.1. *If $A \subset B$ is an irreducible finite index subfactor with Q-system $\Theta = (\theta, w, x)$ and the rigid C^*-tensor category $\langle\theta\rangle$ generated by θ has a braiding $\varepsilon(\,\cdot\,,\,\cdot\,)$, such that Θ is commutative, i.e. $\varepsilon(\theta, \theta)x = x$. Then $\operatorname{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma)$ is commutative, i.e. γ has no multiplicities.*

Proof. The algebra $Q = \operatorname{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma) = \gamma(A)' \cap A$ is commutative if and only if γ has no multiplicities. But we can use the commutativity of the Q-system Θ which implies that the convolution product on $\hat{Q} = \operatorname{Hom}(\theta, \theta)$ is commutative. Informally, using the Fourier transformation $\mathcal{F} \colon Q \to \hat{Q}$ we have

$\mathcal{F}(ab) = \mathcal{F}(a) * \mathcal{F}(b) = \mathcal{F}(b) * \mathcal{F}(a) = \mathcal{F}(ba)$ for $a, b \in Q$. In the endomorphism notation using the Q-system property and the naturality of the braiding this looks like:

$$\begin{aligned} ab &= [M:N]^3 \gamma(v^*)\iota(x^*w^*)\gamma(a\iota(w))\gamma^2(b\iota(w))\bar{\iota}(x) \\ &= [M:N]^3 \gamma(v^*)\iota((\varepsilon(\theta,\theta)x)^*w^*)\gamma(a\iota(w))\gamma^2(b\iota(w))\bar{\iota}(\varepsilon(\theta,\theta)x) \\ &= [M:N]^3 \gamma(v^*)\iota(x^*w^*)\gamma(b\iota(w))\gamma^2(a\iota(w))\bar{\iota}(x) = ba\,. \end{aligned}$$

We invite the reader to draw the diagram. □

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a conformal net and $\mathcal{A}$ a finite index subnet, and consider the subfactor $A = \mathcal{A}(I) \subset B = \mathcal{B}(I)$. Then the canonical $\gamma \in \mathrm{End}(B)$ has no multiplicities.*

Proof. The dual canonical Q-system (θ, w, x) is commutative by [LR95, 4.4. Corollary] and the statement follows from Proposition 4.1. □

Let us choose

$$\gamma = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \mathrm{Ad}(v_i) \circ \beta_i$$

a decomposition of γ into irreducible sectors, where $v_i \in \mathrm{Hom}(\beta_i, \gamma)$ with $i = 0, \dots, n$ are representation the generators of the Cuntz algebra $\mathcal{O}_{n+1}$. We may and do choose $\beta_0 = \mathrm{id}_B$ and $v_0 = v$. We remember that we assume that γ has no multiplicities, thus $[\beta_i] \neq [\beta_j]$ if $i \neq j$ and $\mathrm{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma) = \gamma(B)' \cap B$ is a commutative algebra.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $(\gamma = \iota\bar{\iota}, v, \iota(w))$ be an irreducible Q-system. The maps*

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\beta_i, \gamma) \ni v_i \longmapsto \sqrt{\frac{d_\gamma}{d_i}} \begin{cases} v_i^*\iota(w) & \in \mathrm{Hom}(\iota, \beta_i\iota) \\ \bar{\iota}(v_i)^* w & \in \mathrm{Hom}(\bar{\iota}, \bar{\iota}\beta_i) \end{cases}$$

are anti-isomorphism of the respective Hilbert spaces.

Proof. We have that $v_i^*\iota(w) = v_i \cdot (1_\iota \otimes w) \in \mathrm{Hom}(\iota, \beta_i\iota)$ is a multiple of an isometry. Then we get $\Phi_\iota(\iota(w)v_i^*v_i\iota(w)) = \Phi_\gamma(v_iv_i^*) = \frac{d_i}{d_\gamma}\Phi_{\beta_i}(v_i^*v_i) = \frac{d_i}{d_\gamma} \cdot 1$ using sphericality and the trace property. □

Let us define normal completely positive maps ϕ_i by

$$\frac{d_i}{d_\gamma}\,\phi_i(\,\cdot\,) := \iota(w^*)v_i\beta_i(\,\cdot\,)v_i^*\iota(w) = \iota(w^*)\gamma(\,\cdot\,)v_iv_i^*\iota(w)\,.$$

With this normalization, the maps $\phi_i \colon B \to B$ are also a unital maps. Namely, they are of the form $\phi_i = x_i^*\beta_i(\,\cdot\,)x_i$ with x_i isometries by Lemma 4.3. It also follows directly that $\phi_i \circ \iota = \iota$. Namely,

$$\frac{d_i}{d_\gamma}\phi_i(\iota(a)) = \iota(w^*)v_i\beta_i(\iota(a))v_i^*\iota(w) = \iota(w^*)\iota(\theta(a))v_iv_i^*\iota(w) = \iota(a)\iota(w^*)v_iv_i^*\iota(w) = \frac{d_i}{d_\gamma}\,\iota(a)$$

for all $a \in A$ using Lemma 4.3. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_i \circ \phi_j(\,\cdot\,) &= \frac{d_\gamma^2}{d_i d_j}\, \iota(w^*) v_i \beta_i(\iota(w^*) v_j \beta_j(\,\cdot\,) v_i^* \iota(w)) v_i^* \iota(w) \\
&= \frac{d_\gamma^2}{d_i d_j}\, \iota(w^*) \gamma(\,\cdot\,) \underbrace{\iota(w^*)(v_i \otimes v_j)(v_i^* \times v_j)\iota(w)}_{\in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma)} \iota(w) \\
&= \frac{d_\gamma}{d_k} \sum_k C_{ij}^k \cdot \iota(w^*) \gamma(\,\cdot\,) \underbrace{v_k v_k^*}_{\in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma)} \iota(w) \\
&= \sum_k C_{ij}^k \cdot \phi_k(\,\cdot\,)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used that $\mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma) \cong \mathbb{C}^{\#K}$ with basis $v_i v_i^*$ and $\sum_k v_k v_k^* = 1$. The coefficients C_{ij}^k are given by:

$$C_{ij}^k v_k v_k^* = \frac{d_\gamma d_k}{d_i d_j} v_k v_k^* \left(\iota(w^*)(v_i \otimes v_j)(v_i \otimes v_j)^* \iota(w)\right) v_k v_k^* \tag{1}$$

$$C_{ij}^k = \frac{d_\gamma d_k}{d_i d_j} \left\| (v_i^* \otimes v_j^*) \cdot x \cdot v_k \right\|^2_{\mathrm{Hom}(\beta_k, \beta_i\beta_j)} = \frac{d_\gamma d_k}{d_i d_j} \left\| v_i^* \beta_i(v_j^*) x v_k \right\|^2_{\mathrm{Hom}(\beta_k, \beta_i\beta_j)},$$

with the norm $\|a\|^2_{\mathrm{Hom}(\beta_k,\beta_i\beta_j)} = (a,a)_{\mathrm{Hom}(\beta_k,\beta_i\beta_j)}$.

Because $[\gamma] = [\bar{\gamma}]$ we can define the involution $i \mapsto \bar{i}$, such that $[\beta_{\bar{i}}] = [\bar{\beta}_i]$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $A \subset B$ be an irreducible finite index subfactor, such that the canonical endomorphism γ has no multiplicities.*

Then the coefficients C_{ij}^k with $\phi_i \circ \phi_j = \sum_k C_{ij}^k \phi_k$ as above together with the involution $[i] \to [\bar{i}]$ (defined by $[\bar{\beta}_i] = [\beta_{\bar{i}}]$) defines a hypergroup $K = \{c_0, \ldots, c_n\}$.

There is a Haar element $e_K \in \mathbb{C}K$ defined by

$$e_K = \frac{1}{d_\gamma} \sum_i w_i c_i \in \mathrm{Conv}(K)$$

with $w_i = d_i$ the weight of c_i and $D(K) = d_\gamma \equiv [B : A]$.

Proof. Since $\phi_0 = \mathrm{id}_B$ and the composition is associative it follows that $\mathbb{C}K$ is a unital associative algebra. Property (1) is clear from the definition and (2) follows from the unital property by applying both sides to 1. To see (3) we note that $i \neq \bar{j}$ we have that $\mathrm{Hom}(\beta_0, \beta_i\beta_j) = \{0\}$ and it follows from the standardness of (v,w) that $C_{i\bar{i}}^0 = 1/d_i$. Finally, we have to check the $*$-property. We may assume $\bar{\beta}_i = \beta_{\bar{i}}$. Using the rotation $v_i \mapsto v_i^\bullet$

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\beta_i, \gamma) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\beta_{\bar{i}}, \gamma)$$



(2)

we get that $v_{\bar{i}}$ coincides with $v_i^\bullet$ up to a phase. Then it is straight forward to show

$$\phi_{\bar{j}} \phi_{\bar{i}} = \sum_k C_{ij}^k \phi_{\bar{k}}$$

thus the desired property. □

The map $c_i \mapsto \phi_i$ defines (by linear extension) the map $\phi\colon \mathbb{C}K \to \mathrm{Maps}(B)$, which restricts to a map $\phi\colon \mathrm{Conv}(K) \to \mathrm{UCP}(B)$. Then the conditional expectation is by definition given by $E(\,\cdot\,) = \phi(e_K)(\,\cdot\,)$.

Let us assume we have a unit vector Ω, which is cyclic and separating for B, such that $(\Omega, E(b)\Omega) = (\Omega, b\Omega)$, i.e. the conditional expectation E preserves the vector state $\varphi = (\Omega,\ \cdot\ \Omega)$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $x_i = \sqrt{d_\gamma/d_i}v_i^*\iota(w)$. Then $\phi_i = x_i^*\beta_i(\,\cdot\,)x_i$ is a minimal Stinespring representation, i.e. $\overline{\beta_i(B)x_i\mathcal{H}} = \mathcal{H}$*

Proof. We have to show that the set $\mathcal{V} = \overline{\beta_i(B)x_i\mathcal{H}_B}$ equals $\mathcal{H}_B$. But the space $\mathcal{V}$ is invariant under $\beta_i(B)$ and B' (even $\langle\beta(B), x_i\rangle$). Thus the projection onto $\mathcal{V}$ is in $\beta_i(B)' \cap B = \mathbb{C}$ which proves the statement. □

We remember that a normal unital complete positive map ϕ with $\varphi \circ \phi = \varphi$ is called a **Ω-preserving stochastic map** and Ω-adjoint is Ω-preserving stochastic map $\phi^\sharp$ fulfilling $\varphi(\phi^\sharp(a)b) = \varphi(a\phi(b))$ for all $a, b \in B$.

It turns out that already the representation of the conditional expectation using the Q-system is a minimal Stinespring representation.

Lemma 4.6. *$E(\,\cdot\,) = \iota(w)^*\gamma(\,\cdot\,)\iota(w)\colon B \to A \subset B$ is the minimal Stinespring representation.*

Proof. We have $\gamma(v^*)\iota(w) = \iota(\bar\iota(v^*)w) = d_\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\cdot 1$ because (v, w) is a standard solution of the conjugate equation for γ. But then $\gamma(B)\iota(w)\mathcal{H} \supset \gamma(v^*)y\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}$, thus the representation is minimal. □

Lemma 4.7. *We have $E(a\phi_k(b)) = E(\phi_{\bar k}(a)b)$ and $E \circ \phi_k = E$. In particular, $\phi_k \in \mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(B)$ and $\phi_k^\sharp = \phi_{\bar k}$.*

Proof. Using the trace property and rotation as in (2) we have:

$$\begin{aligned} E(a\phi_k(b)) &= E(ax_k^*\beta_k(b)x_k) \\ &= E(R_k^*\beta_{\bar k}(x_k^*ax_k\beta_k(b))R_k) \\ &= E(R_k^*\beta_{\bar k}(x_k^*ax_k)R_kb) \\ &= E(x_{\bar k}^*\beta_{\bar k}(a)x_{\bar k}b) \\ &= E(\phi_{\bar k}(a)b)\,, \end{aligned}$$

where $d_k^{-\frac{1}{2}}R_k$ is the up to phase unique isometry in $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{id}, \beta_{\bar k}\beta_k)$. Using Lemma 4.3 we get

$$E \circ \phi_k(\,\cdot\,) = \frac{d_\gamma}{d_k}\iota(w)^*\gamma(\iota(w)^*\gamma(\,\cdot\,)v_kv_k^*\iota(w))\iota(w) = \frac{d_\gamma}{d_k}\iota(w)^*\gamma(\,\cdot\,)\underbrace{\iota(w^*\bar\iota(v_kv_k^*)w)}_{=\frac{d_k}{d_\gamma}}\iota(w) = E(\,\cdot\,)\,.\square$$

Lemma 4.8. *The stochastic maps $\{\phi_k\}_{k=0}^n$ are affine independent, i.e. $\{\phi_k - \phi_0\}$ are linearly independent.*

Proof. Define $b_k = \phi_{\bar k}(vv^*) \in B$ for $1 \le k \le n$. We have that $\phi_0(b_k)v \equiv m_kv = 0$. Then $\phi_\ell(b_k)v = \delta_{k,\ell}c_kv$ for some positive numbers c_k. This shows that $\{\phi_k - \phi_0\}_{1\le k\le n}$ are linearly independent. □

Remark 4.9. Since $E(vv^*) = [B : A]^{-1}\cdot 1$ it follows that with $\xi = [B : A]^{\frac{1}{2}}\cdot vv^*\Omega$ the map $\mathbb{C}K \ni x \mapsto (\xi, V(x)\xi)$ gives the normalized trace on $\mathbb{C}K$. Namely, $(\xi, V_k\xi) = [B : A]\cdot(\Omega, vv^*\phi_k(vv^*)\Omega) = \delta_{k,0}$.

Proposition 4.10. *The convex space $\mathrm{Conv}(\{\phi_0, \dots, \phi_n\})$ is an n-simplex in $\mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(B)$. It coincides with the space of all A–A bimodular maps in $\mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(B)$.*

Proof. Using Lemma 4.5 and Proposition A.5 it follows that ϕ_k are extreme points in $\mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(B)$. By Lemma 4.8 they are affine independent.

For the second statement it is enough to show that the space of A–A bimodular maps has dimension $n+1$. We have the unique Fourier decomposition $b = \sum \iota(b_{\rho,i})\psi_{\rho,i}$ as before. Let $\phi\colon B \to B$ be a A–A bimodular map. From $\phi(\psi_{\rho,i})\iota(a) = \phi(\psi_{\rho,i}\iota(a)) = \phi(\iota\rho(a)\psi_{\rho,i}) = \iota\rho(a)\phi(\psi_{\rho,i})$ for all $a \in A$ follows $\phi(\psi_{\rho,i}) \in \mathrm{Hom}(\iota, \iota\rho)$ and ϕ is determined by $\dim \mathrm{Hom}(\theta,\theta) = \dim \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma) = n+1$ coefficients. □

Theorem 4.11. *Let $(A \subset B, \Omega)$ be an irreducible finite index type III subfactor $A \subset B$, such that the dual canonical endomorphism has no multiplicities. Let Ω be cyclic and separating for B, such that $(\Omega, E(\,\cdot\,)\Omega) = (\Omega,\ \cdot\ \Omega)$ for the unique conditional exptectation $E\colon B \to A \subset B$. Then there is a canonical hypergroup K and a Ω-preserving normal faithful action on B, such that $A = B^K$.*

Let $\tilde{K}$ be another Ω-preserving faithful normal action, such that $B^{\tilde{K}} = A$, then there is an isomorphism $\tau\colon K \to \tilde{K}$, such that $\tilde{\phi}_{\tau(k)} = \phi_k$.

Proof. The unique conditional expectation $E\colon B \to \iota(A) \subset B$ can be written as $E = \mathrm{Ad}\,\iota(w)^*\gamma$ and every pure UCP map corresponds to a minimal projection $p \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma) \cong \mathbb{C}^k$ and is independent of the choice of decomposition of $\gamma = \sum \mathrm{Ad}\, v_k \circ \beta_k$. If we choose a different Q-system $(\tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{v}, \tilde{y})$ associated with $(A \subset B, \Omega)$, then there is [Lon94] a unitary $u \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma, \tilde{\gamma})$, such that $u\tilde{v} = v$ and $\tilde{y}u = (u \otimes u)y$. Finally, (1) does not depend on the choice of the Q-system, since $\mathrm{Ad}\, u$ maps minimal projection to minimal projections.

The conditional expectation is unique which implies $D_K^{-1}\sum_k d_k\phi_k = D_{\tilde{K}}^{-1}\sum_{\tilde{k}} d_{\tilde{k}}\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{k}}$. By Proposition 3.4 $\tilde{\phi}_{\tilde{k}}$ are A–A bimodular and by assumption they are extremal and affine independent. Therefore, by Proposition 4.10 there is a $\tau\colon K \to \tilde{K}$, such that $\tilde{\phi}_{\tau(k)} = \phi_k$. □

Example 4.12. Let $\mathcal{F} \equiv {}_N\mathcal{F}_N \subset \mathrm{End}(N)$ with N a type III factor (e.g. the hyperfinite type III_1 factor) and $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F}) = \{[\rho_0], \ldots, [\rho_n]\}$ be a UFC, and $B := N \otimes N^{\mathrm{op}}$. Let $\gamma \in \mathrm{End}(B)$ be the canonical endomorphism associated with the Longo–Rehren Q-system (γ, v, z), see Section 2.4. Let $A = E(B) \subset B$ be the Longo–Rehren inclusion with conditional expextation $E(\,\cdot\,) = z^*\gamma(\,\cdot\,)z$. Then $\beta_i = \rho_i \otimes \rho_i^{\mathrm{op}}$, $w_i = (d\rho_i)^2$ and direct calculation shows:

$$C_{ij}^k = \sqrt{\frac{w_k}{w_i w_j}}N_{ij}^k = \frac{d\rho_k}{d\rho_i d\rho_j}\dim \mathrm{Hom}(\rho_k, \rho_i\rho_j)\,.$$

In particular, we have an action of $K_{\mathcal{F}}$ on B, such that $A = B^{K_{\mathcal{F}}}$. From a cyclic and separating vector ξ for B, we get a vector Ω, such that $(\Omega, b\Omega) = (\xi, E(b)\xi)$ for all $b \in B$ and we get therefore a Ω-preserving faithful action of $K_{\mathcal{F}}$ on B.

4.2. **Graphical Representation of Stochastic Maps.** Using the graphical calculus as in [BKLR16] we draw the conditional expectation as:

$$E_K = \frac{1}{\sqrt{D(K)}}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{D(K)}}\sum_k$$


$$= \frac{1}{D(K)}\sum_k d_k\frac{\sqrt{D(K)}}{d_k}$$


,

where we use the convention that the vertices are normalized to be isometries in $\mathrm{Hom}(\beta_k, \iota\bar{\iota})$. The stochastic maps ϕ_k and $\phi_i \circ \phi_j$ are therefore represented as:

$\phi_k = \frac{\sqrt{D(K)}}{d_k}$


, $\qquad \phi_i \circ \phi_j = \frac{D(K)}{d_i d_j}$


$= \sum C_{ij}^k\frac{\sqrt{D(K)}}{d_k}$


.

Here we used that the coefficients (1) are given by:

$$C_{ij}^k \cdot$$ 

$$= \frac{d_k\sqrt{d\gamma}}{d_i d_j} \cdot$$ 

.

4.3. **Galois Theory.** Let $A \subset B$ be an irreducible finite index type III subfactor with canonical endomorphism $\gamma = \iota\bar{\iota} \in \mathrm{End}(B)$ and Q-system $(\gamma, v, \iota(w))$. There is a one-to-one correspondence between projections $P \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma)$ with

$$Pv = v\,, \qquad\qquad \iota(w)^*(P \otimes P)\iota(w) = \lambda \cdot P$$

for some $\lambda > 0$ [ILP98, BKLR15] and intermediate factors M with $A \subset M \subset B$. In this case $\lambda = [M : A]^{-1}$.

Let us assume that $\iota(A) \subset B$ has an intermediate factor M, i.e. $\iota(A) \subset \iota_M(M) \subset B$. Then we have the subfactors $\iota_M(M) \subset B$ and $\iota_A(A) \subset M$ with $\iota_A = \iota_M^{-1} \circ \iota$, thus $\iota = \iota_M \circ \iota_A$.

Proposition 4.13. *Let K be the canonical hypergroup associated with $(A \subset B, \Omega)$. (Then $A = B^K$.) There is a one-to-one correspondence between*

- *subhypergroups $L \subset K$ and*
- *intermediate subfactors $A \subset M \subset B$*

given by $M = B^L$ and $L = \{k \in K : \phi_k(m) = m \text{ for all } m \in M\}$.

The conditional expectation is given by $E_L = \phi(e_L)$, where $e_L = \frac{1}{D(L)} \sum_{k \in L} w_k c_k$ is the Haar element of L.

Proof. Let $L \leq K$, then L corresponds to a unique projection $P \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma) \cong \mathbb{C}^{|K|}$ and since L is a subhypergroup, i.e. $c_0 \in L$ and $LL \subset \mathbb{C}L$, we have (4.3). Conversely, given an intermediate subfactor M, it corresponds to a projection $P \in \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma, \gamma)$ corresponding to a subsector $\gamma_P \prec \gamma$ and therefore to a subset $L \subset K$. We have $L^* = L$ since γ_P has the structure of a Q-system and is therefore self-dual. Finally, (4.3) gives $LL \subset \mathbb{C}L$.

Let $e_L = \frac{1}{D(L)} \sum_{c_l \in L} w_l c_l$ and $E_L = \phi(e_L)$ then $\phi_l \circ E_L = E_L$ for $c_l \in L$ and therefore $L \subset \{k \in K : \phi_k(m) = m \text{ for all } m \in M\}$. Conversely, to see $L \supset \{k \in K : \phi_k(m) = m \text{ for all } m \in M\}$ we note that for $k \in K \setminus L$, we have $E_L \circ \phi_k \circ E_L \neq E_L$. Namely, since the representation of $\mathbb{C}K$ is faithful it is enough to show that $e_L c_k e_L \neq e_L$, which follows from Proposition 2.16. It independently follows from the proof of the following Proposition 4.16.

By construction the conditional expectation $E_L \equiv \phi(e_L)$ coincides with the conditional expectation E_M onto M. □

Let K be a hypergroup and $F \subset K$ a subset, we denote by $\langle F \rangle$ the subhypergroup generated by F, i.e. the smallest subhypergroup containing F. It follows easily that $\langle F \rangle = \{c_k \in K : c_k \prec$ finite word in $F \cup F^*\}$

Corollary 4.14. *If $K = \langle c_k \rangle$, then M^K equals $M^{\phi_k} = \{m \in M : \phi_k(m) = m\}$.*

Proof. We have that $M^K \subset M^{\phi_k} \subset M$, but by Proposition 4.13 there is a subhypergroup $L \subset K$, such that $M^{\phi_k} = M^L$ and since c_k generates K it follows from the proof that $c_k \in L$ and therefore $K = L$. □

Lemma 4.15. *Let $\iota(A) \subset B$, such that $\gamma = \iota\bar{\iota}$ has no multiplicities, and $\iota_M\iota_A(A) \subset \iota_M(M) \subset B$ an intermediate subfactor, i.e. $\iota_M\iota_A = \iota$. Then $\gamma_A = \iota_A\bar{\iota}_A$ associated with $\iota_A(A) \subset M$ has no multiplicities.*

Proof. Suppose γ_A multiplicities, i.e. there is an irreducible β with $\langle \beta, \gamma_A\rangle > 1$. There is always an irreducible β_B and a non-trivial $t \in \mathrm{Hom}(\beta_B, \iota_M\beta\iota_M)$. But then with the embedding $\mathrm{Hom}(\beta, \gamma_A) \ni w \mapsto (\iota_M \otimes w \otimes \bar{\iota}_M)\cdot t \in \mathrm{Hom}(\beta_B, \gamma)$, we get $\langle \beta_B, \gamma\rangle \geq \langle \beta, \gamma_A\rangle > 1$ which is a contradiction. □

Proposition 4.16. *Let K be the canonical hypergroup associated with $(A \subset B, \Omega)$ and therefore $A \equiv B^K$ and $L \leq K$ a subhypergroup.*

Then there is a natural action of $K//L$ on $M \equiv B^L$, which coincides with canonical action of the hypergroup aossciated with $(A \subset M \equiv B^L, \Omega)$. In particular, $A = M^{K//L} = (B^L)^{K//L}$ and the weights fulfill $D(K) = D(L)\cdot D(K//L)$.

Proof. Let $L \leq K$ be subhypergroup. Let us write $[k] = e_L c_k e_L \in K//L$. Since $\phi([k]) = E_L \circ \phi_k \circ E_L$ the map $\tilde{\phi}_{[k]} = \iota_L^{-1} \circ E_L \circ \phi_k \circ \iota_L$ is well-defined, where ι_L is the canonical inclusion of B^L into B. It follows directly that this fulfills properties of an action of $K//L$ on M.

By Lemma 4.15 $\tilde{\gamma} = \iota_A\bar{\iota}_A$ has no multiplicities and we get a hypergroup $\tilde{L}$ with an action $\psi\colon \tilde{L} \to \mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(M)$, such that $\iota_A(A) \equiv M^{\tilde{L}} \subset M$.

Let $[\tilde{\gamma}] = \bigoplus_{l\in\tilde{L}}[\tilde{\beta}_l]$, then $[\gamma] = \bigoplus_{k\in K}[\beta_k] = \bigoplus_{l\in\tilde{L}}[\iota_M\tilde{\beta}_l\bar{\iota}_M]$. Since γ and $\tilde{\gamma}$ have no multiplicities, we get a surjective map $\ell\colon K \to \tilde{L}$ fixed by the requirement that $\beta_k \prec \iota_M\tilde{\beta}_{\ell(k)}\bar{\iota}_M$ for all $k \in K$. The conditional expectation onto A factorizes as follows:

$$E_K = \frac{1}{\sqrt{D(K)}}$$



$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{D(K)}} \sum_{\substack{k\in K\\ l=\ell(k)}}$$



.

This gives

$$E_L \circ \phi_k \circ \iota_L = \frac{1}{d_k}\sqrt{\frac{D(L)}{D(K)}}$$



$$= \frac{1}{d_{\ell(k)}}\sqrt{\frac{D(L)}{D(K)}}$$



$$= \iota_L \circ \psi_{\ell(k)}\,,$$

which shows that ℓ factors through to be a bijection $\ell\colon K//L \to \tilde{L}$ and that $\tilde{\phi}_{[k]} = \psi_{\ell(k)}$. □

Remark 4.17. The proof implies that $K//L$ is a hypergroup without using Proposition 2.16. The proof also shows that we have an exact sequence:

$$\{c_0\} \longrightarrow L \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow K//L \longrightarrow \{\tilde{c}_0 \equiv e_L\}\,.$$

4.4. **Nilpotent Hypergroups and Intermediate Groups.** We can ask if the intermediate inclusions are coming from group fixed points. Let K be a hypergroup. We remember that a K is graded by $G_K = K//K_{\mathrm{ad}}$, where $K_{\mathrm{ad}} = \{c_l \prec c_k c_{\bar{k}} \text{for } c_k \in K\}$ is the adjoint hypergroup.

By iteratively taking the adjoint hypergroup, we get the following finite sequence of proper subhypergroups:

$$K_0 = K \supsetneq K_1 = K_{\mathrm{ad}} \supsetneq K_2 = (K_1)_{\mathrm{ad}} \supsetneq \cdots \supsetneq K_N = (K_{N-1})_{\mathrm{ad}}\,, \qquad K_{i+1} = (K_i)_{\mathrm{ad}}\,,$$

with $(K_N)_{\mathrm{ad}} = K_N$. We get a sequence $(G_i)_{1\leq i\leq N}$ of finite groups given by

$$G_i = K_{i-1}//K_i\,, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq N\,.$$

Then the weight of K is given by $D(K) = |G_1||G_2|\cdots|G_N|\cdot D(K_N)$. The hypergroup K is called **nilpotent** (cf. [EGNO15, Definition 3.6.7]) if $K_N = \{c_0\}$ for some $N \geq 0$.

Corollary 4.18. *If K is the canonical hypergroup associated with $(A \subset B, \Omega)$, i.e. $A = B^K$, then by applying Proposition 4.16 recursively, we get*

$$B^K = (\cdots((B^{K_N})^{G_N})^{G_{N-1}}\cdots)^{G_1}\,.$$

In particular, if K is nilpotent, then $D(K) = |G_1||G_2|\cdots|G_N|$ and M_K is an iterated group fixed point algebra

$$M^K = (\cdots(M^{G_N})^{G_{N-1}}\cdots)^{G_1}\,.$$

Example 4.19. Let G be an abelian group and $\mathcal{F}$ be a unitary fusion category of Tambara–Yamagami type (see [TY98, Izu01]), i.e. $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F}) = G \cup \{\rho\}$ with fusion rules:

$$[\rho]^2 = \bigoplus_{g\in G}[g]\,, \qquad [g][\rho] = [\rho][g] = \rho\,, \qquad [g][h] = [gh]\,, \qquad \text{for all } g,h \in G\,.$$

Then the universal grading group of $K_{\mathcal{F}}$ is $G_1 = G_{K_{\mathcal{F}}} \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ and $G_2 \cong A$. Let $N \subset M$ be the Longo–Rehren inclusion associated with $\mathcal{F}$. Then $N = (M^G)^{\mathbb{Z}_2}$, this means $N \subset M$ is a Bisch–Haagerup subfactor (see [BH96]) $P^{\mathbb{Z}_2} \subset P \rtimes \hat{G}$. Here $P = M^A$ and $\hat{G}$ is the Pontryagin dual of G.

Let K be a hypergroup and let $K^\times = \{c_k : w_k = 1\} \subset K$ be the **maximal subgroup** or unit ring of K, i.e. the maximal subhypergroup which is a group.

Corollary 4.20. *If K is the canonical hypergroup associated with $(A \subset B, \Omega)$, i.e. $A = B^K$, such that $G := K^\times$ is non-trivial. Then*

$$A = (B^G)^{K//G}\,.$$

4.5. **A Finite Index Subnet Gives a Proper Hypergroup Action.** As before, let $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ be a finite index inclusion of conformal nets. In this subsection we want to show, that this gives rise to a proper action of a hypergroup. We consider $A = \mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I) = B$ and by Corollary 4.2 the canonical endomorphism $\gamma = \iota\bar{\iota}$ has no multiplicities. From $(A \subset B, \Omega)$, we get canonically a hypergroup K and stochastic maps: $\phi_k^I \equiv \phi_k \colon B \to B$.

Indeed we get a compatible family indexed by intervals $I_1 \in \mathcal{I}$ of such actions and hence giving a converse of Theorem 3.8, see Theorem 4.22.

Proposition 4.21. *ϕ_k extends to a compatible and vacuum preserving family $\{\phi_k^{I_1} : \mathcal{B}(I_1) \to \mathcal{B}(I_1) : I_1 \in \mathcal{I}\}$.*

Proof. We remember that every element in $b \in B$ can be written as

$$b = \iota(a)v = \sum_{\rho,e} \iota(a_{\rho,e})\psi_{\rho,e}$$

with $\{\psi_{\rho,e}\}_{e=1}^{\langle\iota,\iota\rho\rangle}$ an orthonormal basis of $\mathrm{Hom}(\iota,\iota\rho)$. Then $\phi_k(\psi_{\rho,e}) \in \mathrm{Hom}(\iota,\iota\rho)$. Let us now take a $I_1 \subset I$. For $\rho \in \mathrm{Rep}^I(\mathcal{A})$ take a sinitary $u \in \mathrm{Hom}(\rho,\rho^{I_1})$ with ρ^{I_1} localized in I_1. Then $\iota(u)\psi_{\rho,e} \in \mathcal{B}(I_1)$ (cf. [LR95, below 4.6 Corollary]).

But then also $\phi_k(\iota(u)\psi_{\rho,e}) = \iota(u)\phi_k(\psi_{\rho,e}) \in \mathcal{B}(I_1)$, thus by linearity and A-bimodularity, we conclude that $\phi_k^{I_1} := \phi_k \restriction \mathcal{B}(I_1) \colon \mathcal{B}(I_1) \to \mathcal{B}(I_1)$ is well-defined.

To show that we can extend a $\phi_k^{I_1} \colon \mathcal{B}(I_1) \to \mathcal{B}(I_1)$ to $\phi_k^{I_2} \colon \mathcal{B}(I_2) \to \mathcal{B}(I_2)$ for all $I_1 \subset I_2$ with $I_i \in \mathcal{I}$ in a compatible way, we assume wlog $I_1 = I$. By [LR95, 3. Thereom] $\gamma \in \mathrm{End}(B)$ can be extended to $\gamma^{I_2} \in \mathrm{End}(\mathcal{B}(I_2))$, such that $\gamma^{I_2} \restriction B' \cap \mathcal{A}(I_2) = \mathrm{id}$ and $\gamma^{I_2} \restriction B = \gamma$. But then

we can define with $\iota_{I_2}\colon \mathcal{A}(I_2) \to \mathcal{B}(I_2) = \iota_{I_2}(\mathcal{A}(I_2))v$ the canonical inclusion with $\iota_{I_2} \restriction A = \iota$ the compatible extension:

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_i^{I_2}(\,\cdot\,) &= \frac{d_\gamma}{d_i}\iota_{I_2}(w^*)\gamma^{I_2}(\,\cdot\,)v_i v_i^*\iota_{I_2}(w)\,,\\
\phi_i^{I_2} \restriction B &= \frac{d_\gamma}{d_i}\iota(w^*)\gamma(\,\cdot\,)v_i v_i^*\iota(w)\\
&= \frac{d_\gamma}{d_i}\iota(w^*)v_i\beta_i(\,\cdot\,)v_i^*\iota(w)\\
&= \phi_i(\,\cdot\,)\,,\\
\phi^{I_2}\circ\iota_2(\,\cdot\,) &= \frac{d_\gamma}{d_i}\iota_{I_2}(w^*)\gamma^{I_2}\circ\iota_{I_2}(\,\cdot\,)v_i v_i^*\iota_{I_2}(w)\\
&= \frac{d_\gamma}{d_i}\iota_2(\,\cdot\,)\iota_{I_2}(w^*)v_i v_i^*\iota_{I_2}(w)\\
&= \frac{d_\gamma}{d_i}\iota_2(\,\cdot\,)\iota(w^*)v_i v_i^*\iota(w)\\
&= \iota_2(\,\cdot\,)\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where in last step we have used [LR95, 3.6 Lemma]. □

It follows directly that K and the representation $V\colon \mathbb{C}K \to \mathrm{B}(\mathcal{H})$ do not depend on the choice of the interval.

Theorem 4.22. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a conformal net on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ a be finite index subnet.*

Then associated with $\mathcal{A}$ there is canonical hypergroup K acting properly on $\mathcal{B}$, such that $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}^K$. Further, there is $*$-representation of $\mathbb{C}K$ on $\mathcal{H}$, such that $\mathcal{A}(I) = \mathcal{B}(I) \cap V(\mathbb{C}K)'$ and $\mathcal{H}$ decomposes as $\mathbb{C}K$ module as

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_\pi \mathcal{H}_\pi\,, \qquad\qquad \mathcal{H}_\pi \cong \mathcal{K}_\pi \otimes \mathcal{M}$$

with $\mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{trivial}} = \overline{\mathcal{A}(I)\Omega}$, where the sum is index by finite dimensional irreducible $*$-representations π of $\mathbb{C}K$ on $\mathcal{K}_\pi$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.11, we get an action on $B = \mathcal{B}(I)$, which extends to the net by Proposition 4.21.

We have that every element in B can be uniquely written as $b = \sum_{\rho\prec\theta}\sum_{i=1}^{\langle\iota,\iota\rho\rangle}\iota(a_{\rho,i})\psi_{\rho,i}$, where $\{\psi_{\rho,i} : i = 1,\dots,\langle\iota,\iota\rho\rangle\}$ is a orthonormal basis of the finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathrm{Hom}(\iota,\iota\rho)$. Then there is a $*$-representation π_ρ of $\mathbb{C}K$ on the finite dimensional Hilbert space $\mathrm{Hom}(\iota,\iota\rho)$ given by bilinearly extending $\pi_\rho(k)\psi_{\rho,j} = \phi_k(\psi_{\rho,j})$. Then $\mathcal{H}_{\pi_\rho} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\langle\iota,\iota\rho\rangle}\overline{\iota(A)\psi_{\rho,i}\Omega}$ and $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{\rho\prec\theta}\mathcal{H}_{\pi_\rho}$ gives the decomposition. On the dense domain $B\Omega$ we have

$$V(k)b\Omega \equiv \sum_{\rho\prec\theta}\phi_k(\iota(a_{\rho,i})\psi_{\rho,i})\Omega = \sum_{\rho\prec\theta}\iota(a_{\rho,i}))\psi_{\rho,i}\Omega\,, \qquad\qquad b = \sum_{\rho\prec\theta}\sum_{i=1}^{\langle\iota,\iota\rho\rangle}\iota(a_{\rho,i})\psi_{\rho,i}\,.$$

□

Remark 4.23. We remark that $\mathbb{C}K$ is isomorphic to the algebra $\mathrm{Hom}(\theta,\theta) = \theta(A)' \cap A$ and π_ρ is the representation on the Hilbert space $\mathrm{Hom}(\rho,\theta)$. Using the Fourier transformation, we get $\mathbb{C}K \cong \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma) = \gamma(B)' \cap B$ as vector spaces (where the multiplication is a convolution product). In the special case, that θ has no multiplicities we get a hypergroup $\hat{K}$ for the inclusion $\gamma(B) \subset \iota(A)$, such that $\mathbb{C}\hat{K} \cong \mathrm{Hom}(\gamma,\gamma)$. If $\hat{K}$ is a (necessarily abelian finite) group, then $\mathcal{H}$ is graded by $\hat{K}$ and

we get the usual Fourier transformation (Pontryagain dualiy) for a fixed point $A = B^G \subset B$ of an action of a finite abelian group $G = K$.

4.6. **Examples.** The easiest non-trivial hypergroup $K = \{c_0 = 1, c_1 = c\}$ has two elements and is generated by c_1. Since it is generated by c_1 multiplication with c_1 defines a **Markov chain** on K see Figure 1. It is given by:

$$c_1 c_1 = \frac{1}{d}\, c_0 + \frac{d-1}{d}\, c_1 \,.$$

It arises from an inclusion of a subfactor $(A \subset B, \Omega)$ (or a finite index inclusion of conformal nets choosing $A = \mathcal{A}(I) \subset B := \mathcal{B}(I)$) with $d = [B : A] - 1$, if and only if the canonical endomorphism γ is given by $[\gamma] = [\beta_0 = \mathrm{id}_B] \oplus [\beta_1]$ with $\beta := \beta_1$ irreducible and $d\beta = d$. In other words, we assume that $\langle \gamma, \gamma \rangle = \langle \theta, \theta \rangle = 2$. This means the subfactor $A \subset B$ is n-supertransitive (as defined in [JMS14]) for some $n \geq 2$. In the case of an action of $K = \{c_0 = 1, c_1 = c\}$ on a completely rational



FIGURE 1. Markov chain of hypergroup $K = \{c_0, c_1\}$ obtained by multiplying with c_1

net $\mathcal{B}$, we get by Corollary 4.14 that

$$\mathcal{A}(I)^K = \mathcal{A}(I)^{\phi^I} \,,$$

where $\phi^I = \phi_1^I$ and $\phi_0^I = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{B}(I)}$ are the stochastic maps. In Table 1 we list some known examples. Many of the examples come from intermediate inclusion as in Corollary 4.20.

d	$\mathcal{B}^K \subset \mathcal{B}$	K
$(3+\sqrt{5})/2 \approx 2.62$	$\mathsf{F}_{4,1} \times \mathsf{G}_{2,1} \subset \mathsf{E}_{8,1}$	$\frac{1}{2}A_4$
$2+\sqrt{3} \approx 3.73$	$\mathsf{SU}(2)_{10} \subset \mathsf{Spin}(5)_1$	$E_6 // A_3$
$2+\sqrt{3} \approx 3.73$	$\mathcal{B} \subset \mathsf{Spin}(16)_1$	$(\mathbb{Z}_2 + 2) // \mathbb{Z}_2$ see Example 4.24
$(5+\sqrt{21})/2 \approx 4.79$	$G_{2,3} \subset E_{6,1}$	$(\mathbb{Z}_3 + 3) // \mathbb{Z}_3$
$(11+3\sqrt{13})/2 \approx 10.91$	$? \subset \mathsf{E}_{6,1} \times \mathsf{SU}(3)_1$	$(\mathbb{Z}_3^2 + 9) // (\mathbb{Z}_3^2)$ see Problem 4.27
$5+2\sqrt{6} \approx 18.80$	$G_{2,4} \subset \mathsf{Spin}(14)_1$	$F // \mathbb{Z}_4$ [EP15, Fig. 27/28]

TABLE 1. Examples of generalized orbifolds by a hypergroup $K = \{c_0, c_1\}$ with $c_1 c_1 = d^{-1} \cdot c_0 + (d-1) d^{-1} \cdot c_1$.

One can easily check that the matrix

$$(\chi_i^m) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -d^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

gives the characters of the hypergroup, i.e. $c_i \mapsto \chi_i^m$ gives a one-dimensional representation for very $m = 0, 1$. It follows as in Remark 4.23 that the dual hypergroup $\hat{K}$ can be identified with K and that the matrix (4.6) defines a bicharacter. This fits together with the general theory for commutative finite hypergroups [Wil97].

It follows that

$$\phi_1^I(a+b) = a - d^{-1} b \,, \qquad\qquad a \in \mathcal{A}(I) \,, b \in \mathcal{B}(I) \ominus \mathcal{A}(I) \,.$$

Namely, every element $b \in \mathcal{B}(I)$ can be written as $b = a_0\psi_0 + a_1\psi_1$ with $a \in \mathcal{A}(I)$, where $\psi_i \in \mathrm{Hom}(\iota, \iota\rho_i)$ ($\psi_0 = 1$) where the dual canonical endomorphism equals $[\theta] = [\rho_0 = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}(I)}] \oplus [\rho_1]$. We have $\phi_i^I(\psi_m) = \chi_j^m \psi_m$. For a general element we get:

$$\phi_i^I(b) = \sum_m a_m \chi_j^m \psi_m\,, \qquad\qquad b = \sum_m a_m \psi_m\,, \quad a_m \in \mathcal{A}(I)\,.$$

We will study the general harmonic analysis in a future publication.

We can ask if K comes from a fusion ring[1] as characterized in Proposition 2.13. But in general it turns out to be no fusion ring. Let us consider $K = \{c_0, c_1\}$ which we rescales with $\tilde{c}_1 = \lambda \cdot c_1$ with $\lambda \in (0, \infty)$, as follows:

$$\tilde{c}_1\tilde{c}_1 = \frac{\lambda^2}{w} \cdot c_0 + \frac{(w-1)\lambda}{w} \cdot \tilde{c}_1\,.$$

The canonical choice to look like a fusion ring is $\tilde{c}_1\tilde{c}_1 = c_0 + \mu \cdot \tilde{c}_1$, i.e. $\lambda = \sqrt{w}$. The following example shows that μ is not necessarily an integer.

Example 4.24. Consider the near group fusion ring of the even part of the E_6 subfactor F (which is $\mathbb{Z}_2 + 2$ in the notation of the following Lemma 4.25) and let $K = K_F//\mathbb{Z}_2 = \{c_0, c_1\}$ (cf. Corollary 4.20), which is realized by conformal nets as follows. Let $\mathcal{B}$ be the net realizing the double of the even part of the E_6 subfactor from [Bis16b] which is a $\mathbb{Z}_2$-simple current extension of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_{10}} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Spin}(11)_1}$. This nets embeds into $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{E}_{8,1}}$:

$$\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Spin}(16)_1} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{E}_{8,1}}\,, \qquad\qquad \mathcal{B} := (\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_{10}} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Spin}(11)_1}) \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2\,.$$

Then the inclusions are generalized orbifolds as follows:

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Spin}(16)_1} = \mathcal{A}_{E_8}^{\mathbb{Z}_2}\,, \qquad\qquad \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}_{E_8}^{K_F}\,, \qquad\qquad \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Spin}(16)_1}^{K_F//\mathbb{Z}_2}\,.$$

In this case, we get $\tilde{c}_1\tilde{c}_1 = c_0 + \sqrt{2} \cdot \tilde{c}_1$ which is not integral.

The lattice of intermediate nets of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_{10}} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Spin}(11)_1} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{E}_{8,1}}$ is given as follows:



,

where $K = \{c_0, c_1\}$ is the hypergroup from above and K_{A_3}, K_{E_6} are the hypergroups corresponding to the respective fusion rings.

More general, for quotients of near group fusion rings by the group we get the following normalization.

[1] The author thanks V.F.R Jones and D. Penneys for asking such a question.

Lemma 4.25. *Consider the near group fusion ring F of type $G+m$, i.e. $F = G \cup \rho$ with $[\rho]^2 = \sum_{g\in G}[g] + m[\rho]$. Then the hypergroup $K = K_F//G = \{c_0, c_1\}$ is given by*

$$c_1c_1 = \frac{1}{w}\cdot c_0 + \frac{w-1}{w}\cdot c_1\,, \qquad\qquad w = \frac{m\sqrt{m^2+4n}+m^2+2n}{2n}\,,$$

which can be rescaled to be:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{c}_1\tilde{c}_1 &= c_0 + \frac{m}{\sqrt{n}}\cdot\tilde{c}_1\,,\\ \hat{c}_1\hat{c}_1 &= n\cdot c_0 + m\cdot\hat{c}_1\,.\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We note that equation (3) is exactly the polynomial whose positive solution is $d\rho$ and that although we do not get a fusion ring we can still get a based ring over $\mathbb{Z}$. It would be interesting if this has a deeper reason when there is a realization by conformal nets. Particularly, $K = \{c_0, c_1\}$ is self-dual and the dual hypergroup plays a certain rules for the fusion of charged fields giving the extension.

Similarly, for the Haagerup–Izumi fusion categories, we have:

Lemma 4.26. *Consider the Haagerup–Izumi fusion ring $F = G\cup\{g\rho\}_{g\in G}$ with $|G| = n$ and fusion rules $[g][\rho] = [g^{-1}][\rho]$, $[\rho]^2 = [e] + \sum_{g\in G}[g\rho]$. Then $K = K_F//G = \{c_0, c_1\}$ with:*

$$c_1c_1 = \frac{1}{w}\cdot c_0 + \frac{w-1}{w}\cdot c_1\,, \qquad\qquad w = \frac{2+n^2+n\sqrt{n^2+4}}{2}\,,$$

which can be rescaled to be:

$$\tilde{c}_1\tilde{c}_1 = c_0 + n\cdot\tilde{c}_1\,. \tag{4}$$

We remark that the fusion rules (4) have categorifications (in terms of fusion categroies) only for $n = 0, 1$ [Ost03], while the Izumi–Haagerup categories are shown to exist for many n, including $n = 9$ [EG11]. It is important to remark that the "rules" (3,4) do not have a direct interpretation of fusion rules.

We give the following problem analogue to the construction of the Haagerup VOA proposed in [EG11].

Problem 4.27. For $w = (11+3\sqrt{13})/2$, find a proper action of the hypergroup $K = \{c_0, c_1 = w^{-1/2}\tilde{c}_1\}$ with $\tilde{c}_1\tilde{c}_1 = c_0 + 3\tilde{c}_1$ on the net $\mathcal{A}_{A_2\times E_6}$ associated with the even lattice of $A_2\times E_6$, such that $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A}^K_{A_2\times E_6})$ is braided equivalent to the quantum double of the Haagerup subfactor.

It is basically enough to construct a non-trivial self-adjoint extremal stochastic map $\phi\in\mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(A)$ on $A = \mathcal{A}_{A_2\times E_6}(I)$ with $\phi\circ\phi = w^{-1}\,\mathrm{id}_A + (1-w^{-1})\phi$. which is compatible with the net structure.

5. Commutative Q-systems in Unitary Modular Tensor Categories and Inclusions of Completely Rational Conformal Nets

5.1. **Quantum Double Subfactors and Lagrangian Q-systems.** In this subsection we want to show that every Lagrangian Q-system comes from a Longo–Rehren subfactor, see Section 2.4. We saw that if a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$ is braided equivalent to $Z(\mathcal{F})$ for a UFC $\mathcal{F}$ then it contains a Lagrangian Q-system, namely Θ from the Longo–Rehren inclusion. The converse is also true.

Let Θ be a Lagrangian Q-system in a UMTC $\mathcal{C} = {}_A\mathcal{C}_A \subset \mathrm{End}(A)$. Consider the category generate by α^+-induction $\mathcal{D}_+ = {}_B\mathcal{C}^+_B$, which is equivalent to the category of modules $\mathcal{C}_\Theta \cong {}_A\mathcal{C}_B$, [BKLR16, BKLR15]. Let $\rho\in{}_A\mathcal{C}_A$, then α^+_ρ has a natural half-braiding $\mathcal{E}_\rho$. Therefore it lifts to the center $Z({}_B\mathcal{C}^+_B)$. We get an equivalence

$${}_A\mathcal{C}_A \to Z({}_B\mathcal{C}^+_B) : \rho\mapsto(\alpha^+_\rho, \mathcal{E}_\rho)$$

and it follows.

Proposition 5.1. *Let Θ be a Lagrangian Q-system in a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$. Then $\mathcal{C}$ is braided equivalent to $Z(\mathcal{D}_+)$. In particular, a UMTC $\mathcal{C}$ admits a Lagrangian Q-system if and only if $\mathcal{C}$ is braided equivalent to $Z(\mathcal{F})$ for some UFC $\mathcal{F}$.*

Proof. We have

$$Z({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+) \cong {}_A\mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{0\,\mathrm{rev}} \cong {}_A\mathcal{C}_A$$

thus $\mathcal{F} = {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+$ does the job. □

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\Theta \in {}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ be a Lagrangian Q-system and $A \subset B$ be the corresponding subfactor. Then*

$${}_A\mathcal{C}_A \to Z({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+) : \rho \mapsto (\alpha_\rho^+, \mathcal{E}_\rho)$$

is a braided equivalence.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\Theta \in {}_A\mathcal{C}_A \subset \mathrm{End}(A)$ be a commutative a commutative Q-system with corresponding subfactor $A \subset B$. Then $\iota\rho \mapsto \alpha_\rho^\pm$ extends to an isomorphism of categories:*

$${}_B\mathcal{C}_A \to {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^\pm$$

Proof. By construction α-induction fulfills $\iota\rho = \alpha_\rho^\pm\iota$. By [BE98, Lemma 3.5], see [BEK99, p. 454] we have $\mathrm{Hom}(\iota\rho, \iota\sigma) = \mathrm{Hom}(\alpha_\rho^\pm, \alpha_\sigma^\pm)$ and the statement follows. □

The map $\alpha_\rho^+ \mapsto \alpha_{\bar\rho}^-$ extends to an equivalence

$$({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+)^{\mathrm{op}} \to {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^- .$$

of unitary fusion categories.

Proposition 5.4. *Let ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ be an UMTC and $A \subset B$ with corresponding Q-system (θ, w, x) in ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$.*

(1) If Θ is commutative, then ${}_M\mathcal{C}_M^+ \cong ({}_M\mathcal{C}_M^-)^{\mathrm{op}}$.

(2) If Θ is Lagrangian, then ${}_M\mathcal{C}_M \cong {}_M\mathcal{C}_M^+ \boxtimes {}_M\mathcal{C}_M^-$.

Proof. The first property can be directly seen by seeing ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B$ as a bimodule category and realizing that the opposite order gives the opposite braiding. For the second statement we can use the relative braiding in [BEK01]. □

Proposition 5.5. *Let Θ be a Lagrangian Q-system in ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ with associated subfactor $A \subset B$. Then Θ is dual to the Longo–Rehren Q-system associated with ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+$, i.e. $A \subset B$ is conjugate to the Longo–Rehren inclusion associated with ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+$.*

Proof. We consider $S = A \otimes A^{\mathrm{op}} \subset T = B \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}}$ given by the Lagrangian Q-system $\Theta \otimes \Theta^{\mathrm{op}}$ in ${}_S\mathcal{C}_S \cong {}_A\mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes {}_A\mathcal{C}_A{}^{\mathrm{rev}}$. But a Lagrangian Q-system in ${}_S\mathcal{C}_S \cong {}_A\mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes {}_A\mathcal{C}_A{}^{\mathrm{rev}}$ comes from the α-induction construction [Reh00], see [BKLR16, Proposition 5.2]. By [Kaw02] it follows that $S \subset T$ is dual to the Longo–Rehren inclusion with respect to ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B$. By Galois correspondence $A \subset B \cong A \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}} \subset B \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}}$ is also dual to a Longo–Rehren inclusion, namely the one with ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+$. □

Corollary 5.6. *Let $A \subset B$ with $\Theta = (\theta, x, w)$ a commutative Q-system in a UMTC ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$. Then $A \subset B$ is conjugated to $S \subset M$, where $S \subset M \subset T$ and $S \subset T$ is the Longo–Rehren subfactor with respect to ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+$.*

Proof. Consider the inclusion $A \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}} \subset B \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}} \subset B_{\mathrm{LR}}$, where $B^{\mathrm{op}} \subset B_{\mathrm{LR}}$ is the Longo–Rehren extension. This gives a Lagrangian Q-system in ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{0\,\mathrm{rev}}$ and the statement follows from Proposition 5.5. □

Therefore $A \subset B$ (from Corollary 5.6) can be seen as a generalized group subgroup subfactor, where we replaced (sub-) groups by unitary fusion (sub-) categories and the group action by the Longo–Rehren subfactor.

Remark 5.7. Since the canonical endomorphisms of the Longo–Rehren inclusion has no multiplicities and Corollary 5.6 implies that the canonical endomorphism γ of a subfactor $A \subset B$ coming from a commutative Q-system in a UMTC ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ has no multiplicties. We note that the statement of Proposition 4.1 is stronger, since it only assumes θ to be a commutative Q-system in any braided rigid C^*-tensor category.

5.2. **Inclusions of Completely Rational Nets and Categorical Restrictions.** We have the following simple lemma.

Lemma 5.8 (cf. [BE99, Corollary 3.18])**.** *Let ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ be a UMTC and (θ, w, x) a commutative Q-system in ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ corresponding subfactor $A \subset B$ and dual Q-system $\Gamma = (\gamma, v, y)$. Then $[\gamma] \cap {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^0 = [\mathrm{id}]$, i.e. if $\alpha \in {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^0$ irreducible with $\alpha \prec \gamma$, then $[\alpha] = [\mathrm{id}]$.*

Proof. By Frobenius reciprocity we have: $\alpha \prec \gamma \equiv \iota\bar{\iota}$ if and only if $\mathrm{id}_A \prec \bar{\iota}\alpha\iota$. Let $\alpha \in {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^0$, then $[\bar{\iota}\alpha\iota] = \bigoplus_\rho b_\alpha^\rho[\rho]$ with $b_\alpha^\rho = \langle \rho, \bar{\iota}\alpha\iota\rangle$. But the blockform [BEK00, Equation 16 and Proposition 3.4]

$$Z_{\rho\sigma} = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathrm{Irr}({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^0)} b_\alpha^\rho b_\alpha^\sigma, \qquad Z = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathrm{Irr}({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^0)} \left| \sum_{\rho \in \mathrm{Irr}({}_A\mathcal{C}_A)} b_\alpha^\rho \chi_\rho \right|^2$$

of the modular invariant $Z_{ij} = \langle \alpha_{\rho_i}^+, \alpha_{\rho_j}^- \rangle$ and the normalization of the modular invariant $Z_{00} = \langle \mathrm{id}_B, \mathrm{id}_B \rangle = 1$ (because B is a factor [BKLR15]) implies $b_\alpha^{\mathrm{id}_A} = \delta_{\alpha,\mathrm{id}_B}$. □

We have the following interpretation for a local finite index inclusion of completely rational nets $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$. Let $\gamma\colon \mathcal{B}(I) \to \mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)$ be the canonical endomorphism. Then it is purely build out of solitonic sectors of $\mathcal{B}$.

Corollary 5.9. *Let ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ be a UMTC and Θ be a commutative Q-system with associated subfactor $A \subset B$. The Jones extension $A \subset B \subset B_1 = B \vee \{e_A\}$, then $B \subset B_1$ comes from a Q-system in ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^0$ if and only if $A = B$.*

In particular, $A \subset B_1$ comes from a commutative Q-system in ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ if and only if $A = B$.

Proof. For the second part we use that local Q-systems $\tilde{\Gamma} \prec \Gamma$ come from commutative Q-systems in $\Gamma \in {}_M\mathcal{C}_M^0$. □

The following corollary shows that Jones basic construction in either of the two directions applied to a non-trivial local inclusions of completely rational nets does not give another net.

Corollary 5.10. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a completely rational net, $A = \mathcal{A}(I)$ and ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A = \mathrm{Rep}^I(\mathcal{A})$ and $B = \mathcal{B}(I)$ for $\mathcal{B} \supset \mathcal{A}$ a finite index local extension. Consider the basic construction $A_1 = \bar{\iota}(A) \subset A \subset B \subset B_1 = B \vee \{e_A\}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) B_1 comes from a subnet of $\mathcal{A}$,
(2) B_1 gives a (non-local) extension of $\mathcal{B}$, and
(3) $A = B$, i.e. $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}$.

Proof. (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1), (2) are trivial. Given (2) Corollary 5.9 implies $A = B$. Similarly, if (1) holds then $A_1 = A$ and therefore $A = B$. □

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a completely rational conformal net, i.e. $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$ is UMTC. The following proposition gives restriction on the possible representation categories $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ of a finite index subnet $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$.

We say a functor $K\colon \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{F}$ from a braided UFC $\mathcal{C}$ to a UFC is **central**, if there is a braided functor $\tilde{K}\colon \mathcal{C} \to Z(\mathcal{F})$, such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C} & \xrightarrow{\tilde{K}} & Z(\mathcal{F}) \\ & \searrow^{K} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle F} \\ & & \mathcal{F} \end{array}$$

Proposition 5.11. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a completely rational conformal net. If $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ is a finite index subnet, then*

(1) There is a UFC $\mathcal{F}$ with and a injective functor $\overline{\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})} \to \mathcal{F}$, which is central.

(2) $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ is braided equivalent to $C_{Z(\mathcal{F})}\left(\overline{\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})}\right)$.

Proof. Take $\mathcal{F} := {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+$, then $Z(\mathcal{F}) \cong {}_A\mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{0\,\mathrm{rev}}$ and (2) follows. That ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{0\,\mathrm{rev}} \to {}_B\mathcal{C}_B$ is central follows from the arguments as in [BEK01, Corollary 4.8]. □

We note that this is sufficient for the existence on the level of braided subfactors in the following sense.

Proposition 5.12. *Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a UFC and $\mathcal{D}$ be a UMTC. If there is an injective and central functor $K\colon \overline{\mathcal{D}} \to \mathcal{F}$, then there is a UFC ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ and a commutative Q-system Θ with corresponding subfactor $A \subset B$, such that $\mathcal{F} \cong {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+$ and $\mathcal{D}$ braided equivalent to ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^0$.*

Proof. We may assume that $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathrm{End}(N)$ and by the Longo–Rehren inclusion, see Section 2.4, we get that $Z(\mathcal{F}) \subset \mathrm{End}(A)$ for some A. Let $\mathcal{C} := C_{Z(\mathcal{F})}(\overline{\mathcal{D}})$. Then $Z(\mathcal{F})$ is braided equivalent to $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \overline{\mathcal{D}}$ by [Müg03c, Theorem 4.2]. Then the Longo–Rehren constructions associated with $\mathcal{F}$ gives a Lagrangian Q-system $\tilde{\Theta}$ in $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \overline{\mathcal{D}}$ and we claim that $\Theta \boxtimes \mathrm{id} := \tilde{\Theta} \cap \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathrm{id}$ does the job. As in Corollary 5.6 we get that $\Theta \boxtimes \mathrm{id}$ correspond to the subcategory $\overline{\mathcal{D}} \subset \mathcal{F}$. If we see $\mathcal{C} = {}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ as a category of endomorphisms and consider $A \subset B$ corresponding to Θ, we get that ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^0 \cong \mathcal{D}$ and that $Z({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+) \cong {}_A\mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{0\,\mathrm{rev}}$.

Now we can do the same construction as in the proof of Proposition 5.11 for ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+$ and see that we get isomorphic Lagrangian algebras. Therefore we must have an isomorphism between $\mathcal{F}$ and ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+$ which gives a (braided) equivalence between $\mathcal{D}$ and ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^0$. □

For $K\colon \overline{\mathcal{D}} \to \mathcal{F}$, $K\colon \mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{G}$ injective and central functors we define $\mathcal{F} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{G}$ to be the category of left modules ${}_{\Theta_{\mathrm{LR}}}(\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathcal{G})$, where Θ_{LR} is the canonical Longo–Rehren Q-system in $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{rev}} \boxtimes \mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathcal{G}$. Up to conventions this is in accordance with the notation in [ENO10, Remark 3.9].

Corollary 5.13. *Let ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ be a UMTC and Θ be a commmutative Q-system with corresponding subfactor $A \subset B$, then*

$${}_B\mathcal{C}_B \cong {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+ \underset{B\mathcal{C}_B^0}{\boxtimes} {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^-\,.$$

Proof. As before we consider the inclusion $A \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}} \subset B \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}} \subset B_{\mathrm{LR}}$, and we get with ${}_{B_{\mathrm{LR}}}\mathcal{C}_{B_{\mathrm{LR}}} \cong {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+ \boxtimes {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^-$, that the dual category ${}_{B\otimes B^{op}}\mathcal{C}_{B\otimes B^{\mathrm{op}}}$ is equivalent to ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B \boxtimes {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{0\,\mathrm{rev}}$. One get that $({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^0 \boxtimes {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{0\,\mathrm{rev}})_{\hat{\Theta}_{\mathrm{LR}}} \cong {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^0$ and $({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+ \boxtimes {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{0\,\mathrm{rev}})_{\hat{\Theta}_{\mathrm{LR}}} \cong {}_B\mathcal{C}_B$, which is the same as ${}_{\Theta_{\mathrm{LR}}}({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+ \boxtimes {}_B\mathcal{C}_B^-)$. □

This is formalization of the statement [Ocn01, Theorem 11.1] which considers only the $\mathsf{SU}(2)_k$ case.

Let ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ be UMTC and $A \subset B$ coming from a commutative Q-system in ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$, then we have the following well-known relations for the global dimensions [BEK01, BE00]:

$$\operatorname{Dim}({}_B\mathcal{C}_B) = \operatorname{Dim}({}_A\mathcal{C}_A)\,, \qquad \operatorname{Dim}\left({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{\pm}\right) = [B:A]^{-1}\cdot\operatorname{Dim}({}_A\mathcal{C}_A)\,,$$

$$\operatorname{Dim}\left({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{0}\right) = [B:A]^{-2}\cdot\operatorname{Dim}({}_A\mathcal{C}_A)\,, \qquad \operatorname{Dim}({}_B\mathcal{C}_B) = \frac{\operatorname{Dim}\left({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{+}\right)\cdot\operatorname{Dim}\left({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{-}\right)}{\operatorname{Dim}\left({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{0}\right)}\,,$$

$$\frac{\operatorname{Dim}\left({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{\pm}\right)}{\operatorname{Dim}\left({}_B\mathcal{C}_B^{0}\right)} = [B:A]\,.$$

Remark 5.14. Even without knowing the existence of the net $\mathcal{A}_{\mathrm{Hg}}$ in Problem 4.27 we have on the level of braided subfactors an inclusion $A_{\mathrm{Hg}} \subset A_{E_6A_2} \subset A_{E_8}$. Now by tensoring we get an inclusion $A_{\mathrm{Hg}} \otimes A_{E_6A_2} \subset A_{E_6A_2}$ and it is easy to check $A_{\mathrm{Hg}} \otimes A_{E_6A_2} \subset A_{E_8} \otimes A_{E_8}$ gives $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Hg}} \boxtimes \mathrm{Vect}_{\mathbb{Z}_3}$. But there is another extension coming from the Longo–Rehren extension of $A_{E_6A_2} \otimes A_{E_6A_2}$ (since $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A}_{E6A_2}) \cong \mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A}_{E_6A_2})^{\mathrm{rev}}$). The associated UFC of the inclusion $A = A_{\mathrm{Hg}} \subset B = A_{E_6A_2}$ has to be a $\mathbb{Z}_3^2 + 9$ near group category. Namely, the modular invariant of this inclusion [EG11, (2.4)] is of the form

$$Z = \sum_{i,j} Z_{ij}\chi_i\bar{\chi}_j = |\chi_0+\chi_1|^2 + 2|\chi_2|^2 + 2|\chi_3|^2 + 2|\chi_4|^2 + 2|\chi_5|^2$$

and ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^0 \cong \mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A}_{E_6A_2})$ which has $\mathbb{Z}_3^2$-fusion rules. Since $\mathrm{tr}((Z_{ij})) = 10$, using [BEK99, Corollary 6.13], we know that ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B^+$ has objects $\mathbb{Z}_3^2 \cup \{\rho\}$ and by calculating the global dimension one can conclude that the only possible fusion rules are $\mathbb{Z}_3^2+9$. This observation is related to [Izu15, Example 12.13].

This implies that $\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Hg}} \boxtimes \mathrm{Vect}_{\mathbb{Z}_3}$ and the obtained $\mathbb{Z}_3^2 + 9$ near group category have the same Drinfel'd center. Therefore we have shown:

Proposition 5.15. *$\mathcal{F}_{\mathrm{Hg}} \boxtimes \mathrm{Vect}_{\mathbb{Z}_3}$ is Morita equivalent to the (unique by* [EG14, Table 4]*) $\mathbb{Z}_3^2 + 9$ near group category.*

5.3. **The Structure of Generalized Orbifolds of Completely Rational Nets.** Let us assume that $\mathcal{B}$ is a completely rational conformal net, so in particular $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$ is a UMTC. The restriction of the structure of finite index inclusions of completely rational nets $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$ gives us a complete characterization of proper hypergroup actions on $\mathcal{B}$. A different and harder problem is how to construct these actions without explicitly knowing the subnet.

Theorem 5.16. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a completely rational net and K a hypergroup acting properly on $\mathcal{B}$. Then there is a UFC $\mathcal{F}$ and a central embedding $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})^{\mathrm{rev}} \to \mathcal{F}$, such that $K = K_{\mathcal{F}}//K_{\mathcal{B}}$ and $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B}^K) = C_{Z(\mathcal{F})}(\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})^{\mathrm{rev}})$, where $K_{\mathcal{B}}$ is hypergroup associated with the Verlinde fusion ring of $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})$.*

In particular, if $\mathcal{B}$ is holomorphic, then there exists a unitary fusion category $\mathcal{F}$ with $K = K_{\mathcal{F}}$ and $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B}^K) = Z(\mathcal{F})$.

Proof. This is the special case $M = A$ of Proposition 5.17 below. □

We note that a similar structure of actions of double cosets of fusion rings already appeared in [Xu14, Section 2.11 and Theorem 3.8], but there is no reference to stochastic maps. Further, in the present paper, we are deriving it from an axiomatic notion of an action, whose fixed points are always subnets. Indeed, imposing our axioms such an action is unique. We conjecture that the action in on the charged intertwiners $\{\psi_{\rho,i}\}$ in [Xu14] essentially coincides with $\psi_{\rho,i} \mapsto \phi_k(\psi_{\rho,i})$.

The interpretation of Theorem 5.16 is that a hypergroup K acting properly of on a holomorphic net $\mathcal{B}$ gives a categorification of K. A hypergroup K acting properly of on a completely rational

net $\mathcal{B}$ gives a an extension of $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{B})^{\mathrm{rev}}$ which is central and "hypergraded" by the hypergroup K. We note that the representation of K as a double coset of categorifable fusion rings is in general far from unique.

Proposition 5.17. *Let $\mathcal{B}$ completely rational and K a hypergroup acting properly on $\mathcal{B}$. Let $\Theta = (\theta, w, x)$ be an irreducible Q-system in $\mathrm{Rep}^I(\mathcal{B})$ corresponding to a subfactor $\iota(B) \subset M$ with $B = \mathcal{B}(I)$ and ${}_M\mathcal{C}_M = \langle \beta \prec \iota\beta\bar{\iota} : \beta \in \mathrm{Rep}^I(\mathcal{B})\rangle$ the dual category.*

Then there is an extension of $\mathcal{F} \supset {}_M\mathcal{C}_M$, such that $K = K_{\mathcal{F}}//K_{{}_M\mathcal{C}_M}$. The construction only depends on the Morita equivalence class of Θ.

Proof. Consider $A \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}} \subset B \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}} \subset B_2$ coming from the full center construction of $A \subset M$ as in [BKLR16]. Then [Kaw02] implies that $B \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}} \subset B_2$ is a Longo–Rehren inclusion w.r.t. ${}_M\mathcal{C}_M$ and $A \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}} \subset B_2$ is a Longo-Rehren inclusion with respect to an extension $\mathcal{F}$ of ${}_M\mathcal{C}_M$. Then from Example 4.12 and Proposition 4.16 we get that $A \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}} \subset B \otimes B^{\mathrm{op}}$ and therefore $A \subset B$ is a generalized fixed point with hypergroup $K = K_{\mathcal{F}}//K_{{}_M\mathcal{C}_M}$. □

Let us call $\mathcal{F}$ a **K-hypergraded extension** of $\mathcal{G}$ if $K = K_{\mathcal{F}}//K_{\mathcal{G}}$. The proposition gives many K-graded extensions from inclusions of nets. This is just a categorical result and we get:.

Corollary 5.18. *If $\mathcal{D}$ is a UMTC and $\mathcal{F}$ a central extension of $\mathcal{D}$. Let $K = K_{\mathcal{F}}//K_{\mathcal{D}}$. Then there is a K-hypergraded extension for every UFC $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ Morita equivalent to $\mathcal{D}$.*

More generally, let $\mathcal{F}$ be an extension of $\mathcal{G}$ and $K = K_{\mathcal{F}}//K_{\mathcal{G}}$. Then we get a K-graded extension $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ for every Lagrangian Q-system Θ in $Z(\mathcal{G})$, where $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = Z(\mathcal{G})_\Theta$.

Proof. Consider the Longo–Rehren inclusion $S \subset T = M \otimes M^{\mathrm{op}}$ w.r.t. $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathrm{End}(M)$ with ${}_S\mathcal{C}_S \cong Z(\mathcal{F})$. Let $S \subset M \subset T$ be the intermediate subfactor associated with $\mathcal{G}$ and Θ be an Lagrangian Q-system in $Z(\mathcal{G}) \subset {}_M\mathcal{C}_M$ with associated subfactor $M \subset T_\Theta$. Then $M \subset T_\Theta$ is a Longo–Rehren inclusion from $Z(\mathcal{G})_\Theta \cong {}_\Theta Z(\mathcal{G})^+_\Theta$ and $S \subset T_\Theta$ is Longo–Rehren inclusion coming from an extension of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$. Since the hypergroup K can be recovered from $S \subset M$ and $K = K_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}//K_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}$ holds by Proposition 4.16 and Example 4.12, we conclude that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is a K-hypergraded extension of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$. □

6. Possible Generalization to Infinite Actions

We expect that our analysis generalizes to infinite index, were we expect to get semi-compact inclusions. Particularly interesting seem the following inclusions: Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a diffeomorphism covariant net, then there is an irreducible subnet $\mathrm{Vir}_c \subset \mathcal{A}$ and the net Vir_c is minimal by [Car98]. If $\mathcal{A}$ is completely rational and the central charge $c \geq 1$, then we necessarily have that $[\mathrm{Vir}_c(I) : \mathcal{A}(I)] > \infty$. We expect that $\mathrm{Vir}_c \subset \mathcal{A}$ might come from a continuous hypergroup. For $c > 1$ the net Vir_c is not strongly additive and the inclusion is never quasi-regular (discrete) in the sense of [ILP98]. For the case $c = 1$, by [Reh94, Car04, Xu05], we know that $\mathrm{Vir}_{c=1} = \mathcal{A}^{\mathsf{SO}(3)}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_1}$ is a fixed point by a compact group. We can consider $\tilde{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}_{E_7} \equiv \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{E}_{7,1}}$, the conformal net associated with the even lattice E_7, or equivalently cf. [Bis12], with the loop group of E_7 at level 1. The net $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ has the property $\overline{\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_1})} \cong \mathrm{Rep}(\tilde{\mathcal{A}})$ and the Longo–Rehren extension gives $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_1} \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{A}} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{E}_{8,1}}$. We can consider the inclusion

$$\mathrm{Vir}_{c=1} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{E}_{7,1}} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_1} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{E}_{8,1}}\,.$$

We have that $\mathrm{Vir}_{c=1} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{E}_{7,1}}$ contains a symmetric rigid C*-tensor category $\mathcal{C}$ in the sense of [DR89b], which is generated by $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathsf{SO}(3))$ and a $d = 2$ object with trivial twist and $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathsf{SU}(2))$ fusion rules cf. [Xu05, Lemma 4.1]. One can conclude that $\mathcal{C}$ is braided equivalent to $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathsf{SU}(2))$ and that $\mathrm{Vir}_{c=1} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{E}_{7,1}} = \mathcal{A}^{\mathsf{SU}(2)}_{\mathsf{E}_{8,1}} \subset \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{E}_{8,1}}$ is an extension by the dual of a compact group in the sense Doplicher–Roberts reconstruction theorem [DR89a, DR90], see also [Xu05]. We get an action of

the compact group $\mathsf{SU}(2)$ and expect that the inclusion can be seen as a continuous Longo–Rehren inclusion associated with a $\mathsf{SU}(2)$-kernel, i.e. $\alpha\colon \mathsf{SU}(2) \to \mathrm{Out}(M)$ for a type III_1 factor M. We note that this is indeed true for every finite subgroup $G \subset \mathsf{SU}(2)$, where we get a that the module category associated with $\mathcal{A}_{E_8}^G \subset \mathcal{A}$ is a unitary fusion category equivalent to Vect_G^ω for some $[\omega] \in H^3(G, \mathbb{T})$. We also have for $G = \mathbb{Z}_2$ that $[\omega]$ is the non-trivial cohomology class, since $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_1} \otimes \mathcal{A}_{E_7})$ is braided equivalent to $Z(\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_1}))$ and $\mathrm{Rep}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2)_1}) \cong \mathrm{Vect}_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^\omega$, where $[\omega] = 1$ is the non-trivial "generator" in $H^3(\mathbb{Z}_2, \mathbb{T}) \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$.

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be a diffeomorphism covariant conformal net, i.e. there is is an irreducible subnet $\mathrm{Vir} \subset \mathcal{B}$ [Car04, Proposition 3.7], generated by the projective unitary representation of $\mathrm{Diff}(\mathbb{S}^1)$. One could define the "quantum automorphism (semi)group" $\mathrm{qAut}(\mathcal{B})$ of $\mathcal{B}$ to be the convex space of elements ϕ, with

- $\phi = \{\phi^I \in \mathrm{Stoch}_\Omega(\mathcal{B})\}_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ is a compatible family,
- ϕ^I has an Ω adjoint,
- ϕ^I is $\mathrm{Vir}(I)$-bimodular.

One gets that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathrm{qAut}(\mathcal{B})$ and if $\mathrm{Vir} \subset \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{B}$, then the family of conditional expectations $E = \{E_I\colon \mathcal{B}(I) \to \mathcal{A}(I) \subset \mathcal{B}(I)\}_{I \in \mathcal{I}}$ is contained in $\mathrm{qAut}(\mathcal{B})$. Every element in $\phi \in \mathrm{qAut}(\mathcal{B})$ gives an intermediate net $\mathcal{B}^\phi(I) := \mathcal{B}(I)^{\phi^I}$. A proper finite hypergroup action corresponds to a finite simplex inside $\mathrm{qAut}(\mathcal{B})$. It might be enough to consider $\mathrm{qAut}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathcal{B}) \subset \mathrm{qAut}_0(\mathcal{B})$ the set of all these maps which are extremal. From [Car04, Xu05] follows that $\mathrm{qAut}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2),1}) = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{SU}(2),1}) \cong \mathsf{SO}(3)$. For $\mathcal{A} \supset \mathrm{Vir}_c$ with central charge $c < 1$, we have that Vir_c is completely rational and we get that $\mathrm{qAut}_{\mathrm{ext}}(\mathcal{A})$ is finite cf. [KL04]. But for a completely rational net with $c > 1$ everything is open.

Appendix A. Completely Positive Maps

Let A and B be unital C*-algebras. We typically consider $A = B$ and both to be von Neumann algebras. By a map $\phi\colon A \to B$ we always mean a linear map. A map $\phi\colon A \to B$ is called **positive** if $\phi(a) \geq 0$ for all $a \geq 0$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We call ϕ **n-positive** if $\phi \otimes \mathrm{id}\colon A \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C}) \to B \otimes M_n(\mathbb{C})$ is positive and **completely positive** (CP) if it is n-positive for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. A positive map $\phi\colon A \to B$ is automatically hermitian, i.e. $\phi(a^*) = \phi(a)^*$ for all $a \in A$. We call a map $\phi\colon A \to B$ **unital** if $\phi(1) = 1$.

Let A be a C*-algebra and $\phi\colon A \to \mathrm{B}(\mathcal{H})$ be linear map. Then ϕ is completely positive if and only if there is a representation $\pi\colon A \to \mathrm{B}(\mathcal{K})$ and a bounded operator $V \in \mathrm{B}(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$, such that $\phi(\,\cdot\,) = V^*\pi(\,\cdot\,)V$. In this situation $(\pi, V, \mathcal{K})$ is called a **Stinespring dilation**. It is called **minimal** if $\pi(A)V\mathcal{H}$ is dense in $\mathcal{K}$. The minimal Stinespring dilation is unique up .to a unitary equivalence. If V is an isometry, then $V^*\pi(\,\cdot\,)V$ is a unital completely positive map.

If $\phi\colon A \to B$ is a unital completely positive map between C*-algebras, we have the Kadison–Schwarz inequality [Kad52]:

$$\phi(a^*a) \geq \phi(a)^*\phi(a)\,. \tag{5}$$

Theorem A.1 ([Cho74])**.** *If $\phi\colon A \to B$ is a unital 2-positive map between C*-algebras, then $\phi(a^*a) = \phi(a^*)\phi(a)$ if and only if*

$$\phi(xa) = \phi(x)\phi(a)\,, \qquad\qquad \phi(a^*x) = \phi(a^*)\phi(x)\,,$$

for all $x \in A$.

Definition A.2. A completely positive map $\phi\colon A \to B$ is said to be **extremal** if every completely positive map with $\psi\colon A \to B$ with $\phi - \psi$ completely positive, is a scalar multiple of ϕ.

Therefore a unital completely positive map is extremal if and only if it cannot be written as a non-trivial convex combination of two unital completely positive maps.

A.1. **Stochastic Maps.** A pair (M,φ) of a von Neumann algebra M and a faithful normal state φ is called a (non-commutative) **probability space**. Let (M_i,φ_i) with $i=1,2$ be two probalility spaces. A normal unital completely positive map $\phi\colon M_1\to M_2$ is called a **stochastic map** from (M_1,φ_1) to (M_2,φ_2) provided $\varphi_2\circ\phi=\varphi_1$. It is called a **determistic** map if ϕ is a $*$-homomorphism. Let $(\pi_i,\mathcal{H}_i,\Omega_i)$ be the GNS construction of (M_i,φ_i). By abuse of notation we denote by $\phi\colon \pi_1(M_1)\to\pi_2(M_2)$ the map satisfying $\phi(\pi_1(m))=\pi_2(\phi(m))$ for all $m\in M_1$.

A (φ_1,φ_2)–adjoint of ϕ is a stochastic map $\phi^\sharp\colon (M_2,\varphi_1)\to(M_1,\varphi_1)$, such that $\varphi_2(m_2\phi(m_1))=\varphi_1(\phi^\sharp(m_2)m_1)$ for all $m_i\in M_i$. Let $\sigma_t^{\varphi_i}=\operatorname{Ad}\Delta^{\mathrm{i}t}_{(M_i,\Omega_i)}$ the modular flow and $J_i=J_{(M_i,\Omega_i)}$ the modular conjugation. By the Kadison–Schwarz inequality (5) we get a linear contraction $U_\phi\colon\mathcal{H}_1\to\mathcal{H}_2$ defined as the closure of $m\Omega_1\mapsto\phi(m)\Omega_2$ for $m\in M_1$. Note that $U_{\phi^\sharp}=U_\phi^*$. The following are equivalent [AC82, Proposition 6.1], see also [NSZ03]:

(1) ϕ admits (φ_1,φ_2)–adjoint $\phi^\sharp$.
(2) $\phi\circ\sigma_t^{\varphi_1}=\sigma_t^{\varphi_2}\circ\phi$
(3) $J_{\varphi_2}U_\phi=U_\phi J_{\varphi_1}$

and in this case we also call ϕ a (φ_1,φ_2)-preserving Markov map.

We are interested in the case if the non-commutative probability spaces are equal and in standard form (M,Ω), where $M\subset\mathrm{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\Omega\in\mathcal{H}$ a cyclic and separating vector and faithful normal state $\varphi=(\Omega,\,\cdot\,\Omega)$. Let us denote the modular flow by $\sigma_t=\operatorname{Ad}\Delta^{\mathrm{i}t}$ and the modular conjugation by J. Then a stochastic (endo-) map $\phi\colon(M,\Omega)\to(M,\Omega)$ fulfills $(\Omega,\phi(m)\Omega)=(\Omega,m\Omega)$ and a **Ω-preserving Markov (endo-) map** is such a stoachastic map having an adjoint, and therefore fulfills $\phi\circ\sigma_t=\sigma_t\circ\phi$ and $U_\phi J=JU_\phi$.

If $\phi\colon N\to N$ is a stochastic map, we can consider the **fixed point** $N^\phi=\{n\in n:\phi(n)=n\}$. The following proposition is a well-known (cf. e.g. [AGG02]) consequence of Choi's Theorem A.1.

Proposition A.3. *Let (N,φ) be a probability space, i.e. a von Neumann algebra N and faithful state φ. Let $\phi\colon N\to N$ be a φ-preserving stochastic map, i.e. a normal unital completely positive φ-preserving map, then $N^\phi=\{n\in N:\phi(n)=n\}$ is a von Neumann algebra. If $E=\phi$ is an idempotent, i.e. $E^2=E$, then $E(N)$ is a von Neumann algebra and E is the conditional expectation onto its image.*

Proof. By the Kadison–Schwarz inequality (5) we have $y:=\phi(x^*x)-\phi(x^*)\phi(x)\geq 0$ is positive for all $x\in N$. Let $x\in N^\phi$, i.e. $x=\phi(x)$, then

$$\varphi(y)=\varphi(\phi(x^*x)-\phi(x)^*\phi(x))=\varphi(x^*x)-\varphi(x^*x)=0$$

and since y is positive and φ faithful $y\equiv\phi(x^*x)-\phi(x)\phi(x^*)=0$. But then Theorem A.1 implies that N^ϕ is an algebra and by normality it is a von Neumann algebra.

If $E:=\phi$ is an idempotent, then $E(N)=N^E$ and E is a conditional expectation onto its image. □

A.2. **Connes–Stinespring Construction for Stochastic Maps.** Let (M_i,Ω_i) be probability spaces on $\mathcal{H}_i$ and $\phi\colon M_1\to M_2$ a stochastic map with $(\Omega_2,\phi(\,\cdot\,)\Omega_2)=(\Omega_1,\,\cdot\,\Omega_1)$.

The following construction is the Connes correspondence associated with a UCP map [Con94]. Let $\mathcal{H}_\phi$ be the separation and completion of $M_1\otimes_{\mathrm{alg}}\mathcal{H}_2$ with inner product

$$(m\otimes\xi,n\otimes\eta)_\phi=(\xi,\phi(m^*n)\eta)\,.$$

We get a M_1–M_2 correspondence:

$$\begin{aligned} m_1.[m\otimes\xi].m_2&:=m_1m\otimes\xi.m_2\,, & \Omega_\phi&:=[1\otimes\Omega_2]\,,\\ (\Omega_\phi,m_1\Omega_\phi)_\phi&=(\Omega_1,m_1\Omega_1)\,, & m_1&\in M_1\,,\\ (\Omega_\phi,\Omega_\phi m_2)_\phi&=(\Omega_2,\Omega_2m_2)\,, & m_2&\in M_2\,. \end{aligned}$$

We get an isometry $V\colon \mathcal{H}_2 \to \mathcal{H}_\phi$ defined by $V\Omega_2 m_2 = [1 \otimes \Omega m_2] \equiv \Omega_\phi . m_2$. Then $\phi(m) = V^*\pi_\phi(m)V$, where

$$\pi_\phi(m)\xi = m.\xi\,.$$

Let $M_1 \subset M_2$ be type III factors on a separable Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$ cyclic and separating for M_1 and M_2. Then there is a $U_2\colon \mathcal{H}_\phi \to \mathcal{H}_2$ intertwining the right actions of M_2. Let $\rho = \operatorname{Ad} U_2 \circ \pi_\phi\colon M_1 \to M_2$ and $v = U_2 V \in M_2$, then

$$\phi(m) = V^*\pi_\phi(m)V = v\rho(m)v\,.$$

So we get a pair (v, ρ), such that $\varphi_2(v^*\rho(\,\cdot\,)v) = \varphi_1(\,\cdot\,)$. For completely positive maps, we write $\psi \le \phi$ if $\phi - \psi$ is completely positive. The following is well-known, see also [ILP98, Proposition 2.9]

Lemma A.4. *Let M be a type III factor on a separable Hilbert space and Ω cyclic and separating. Let $\phi, \psi \in \operatorname{Stoch}_\Omega(M)$ with $\lambda\psi \le \phi$ for some $\lambda \in (0, 1]$, and let $\phi = v^*\rho(\,\cdot\,)v$ and $\phi = w^*\sigma(\,\cdot\,)w$ be the minimal Stinespring representation with $v, w \in M$ and $\rho, \sigma \in \operatorname{End}(M)$. Then there is a contraction $T \in \operatorname{Hom}(\rho, \sigma)$ with $Tv = \sqrt{\lambda}\cdot w$.*

Proof. Since $\phi - \lambda\psi$ is completely positive we have

$$\lambda \left\| \sum_i \sigma(m_i) w n_i \Omega \right\|^2 = \sum_{ij} (n_i\Omega, \psi(m_i^* m_j) n_j \Omega) \le \sum_{ij} (n_i\Omega, \phi(m_i^* m_j) n_j \Omega) = \left\| \sum_i \rho(m_i) v n_i \Omega \right\|^2$$

and get a contraction T defined by $T\rho(m)vn\Omega = \sqrt{\lambda} n\sigma(m)wn\Omega$. For $m = 1$ it follows that $Tv = \sqrt{\lambda}w$ and therefore $T\rho(m) = \sigma(m)T$. □

The next can be seen as a Radon-Nikodym theorem. It basically follows from [Pas73, 5.4 Proposition].

Proposition A.5. *Let M be a type III factor on a separable Hilbert space and Ω cyclic and separating. Let $\phi \in \operatorname{Stoch}_\Omega(M)$ with minimal Stinespring representation $\phi(\,\cdot\,) = v^*\rho(\,\cdot\,)v$ with $v \in M$ and $\rho \in \operatorname{End}(M)$.*

The linear map $T \mapsto \phi_T(\,\cdot\,) = v^*\sigma(\,\cdot\,)Tv$ is an order preserving bijection between:

- *$\{T \in \rho(M)' \cap M : 0 \le T \le 1\}$ and*
- *the set of normal completely positive maps $\psi\colon M \to M$ with $\psi(1) = \lambda \cdot 1$ and $\lambda \cdot (\Omega, m\Omega) = (\Omega, \psi(m)\Omega)$ for all $m \in M$.*

In particular, ϕ is extremal in $\operatorname{Stoch}_\Omega(M)$ if and only if ρ is irreducible.

Proof. We first show injectivity. Assume that $\phi_T = 0$, then

$$(\rho(a)v\xi, T\rho(b)v\eta) = (\xi, v^*\rho(a^*b)Tv\eta) = (\xi, \phi_T(a^*b)\eta) = 0$$

and then $T = 0$ because the Stinespring representation is minimal.

We claim that for $0 < T \le 1$ we have that ϕ_T is (up to scale) state-preserving. If $\phi_T(1) = (v\Omega, Tv\Omega) = \lambda > 0$, then with $\omega(\,\cdot\,) = (\Omega,\ \cdot\ \Omega)$

$$\omega(m) = \omega \circ \phi(m) = \lambda\omega_T(m) + (1-\lambda)\omega_{1-T}(m)\,, \qquad \omega_S(m) := (v\Omega, S\rho(m)v\Omega)/(v\Omega, Sv\Omega)\,.$$

We can extend to states on the C*-algebra $M \otimes_{\min} M'$ by $\tilde{\omega}_\bullet(m_1 \otimes m_2) = (\Omega\phi_\bullet(m_1)m_2\Omega)/(\Omega, \phi_\bullet(1)\Omega)$ and get $\tilde{\omega} = \lambda\tilde{\omega}_T + (1-\lambda)\tilde{\omega}_{T-1}$. But since $\tilde{\omega} = \tilde{\omega}_1$ is a pure state we get: $\omega_T = \omega_{1-T} = \omega$. □

Appendix B. Tensor Categories

We give some results on braided tensor categories. We refer to [EGNO15] for a textbook. Most of the statements here are in [DMNO13, DNO13]. Some statements are implicitly contained and we sketch a proof.

A fusion category $\mathcal{F}$ over a field $\mathbb{K}$ is a $\mathbb{K}$-linear semisimple rigid tensor category with finitely many isomorphism classes of simple objects and finite dimensional spaces of morphisms, such that the unit object 1 is simple. Every fusion category contains a trivial subcategory consisting of multiples of 1 which we denote Vect. We denote the Grothendieck ring of $\mathcal{F}$ by $K(\mathcal{F})$. It is a fusion ring.

Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a non-degenerate braided fusion category. Non-degenerated means that the centralizer $\mathcal{C}' = C_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathcal{C})$ is trivial, i.e. $\mathcal{C}' \cong \text{Vect}$. Let A be an **étale algebra** in $\mathcal{C}$, i.e. a commutative and separable algebra. It is called **connected** if $\dim \text{Hom}(1, A) = 1$. We denote by $\mathcal{C}_A$ the category of right A-modules. If A is a connected étale algebra, then $\mathcal{C}_A$ is a fusion category. We denote by $\text{FPdim}\, X$, $X \in \mathcal{C}$ the Perron-Frobenius dimension of the object and by $\text{FPdim}\, \mathcal{C} := \sum_{X \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{C})} (\text{FPdim}\, X)^2$. One has $\text{FPdim}\, \mathcal{C}_A = \text{FPdim}\, \mathcal{C} / \text{FPdim}\, A$ [DMNO13, Lemma 3.11]. The Drinfel'd center $Z(\mathcal{C}_A)$ is braided equivalent [DMNO13, Corollary 3.30] to $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_A^{0\,\text{rev}}$, where $\mathcal{C}_A^0$ is the category of dyslexic modules, which is a non-degenerately braided fusion category. One has $\text{FPdim}\, \mathcal{C}_A^0 = \text{FPdim}\, \mathcal{C} / (\text{FPdim}\, A)^2$ [DMNO13, Corollary 3.32]. A connected étale algebra A in $\mathcal{C}$ is called **Lagrangian** if $\text{FPdim}\, A = \sqrt{\text{FPdim}\, \mathcal{C}}$ and this implies $\mathcal{C}_A^0 \cong \text{Vect}$.

There is a Lagrangian algebra A in $\mathcal{C}$ if and only if $\mathcal{C}$ is braided equivalent to the Drinfel'd center $Z(\mathcal{F})$ for a fusion category $\mathcal{F}$. Namely, if A is Lagrangian we have $\mathcal{C} \cong Z(\mathcal{C}_A)$. Conversely define $A = I(1)$, where $I \colon \mathcal{F} \to Z(\mathcal{F})$ is the adjoint of the forgetful functor $F \colon Z(\mathcal{F}) \to \mathcal{F}$. Under this identification $A = I(1)$. If A is Lagrangian, then ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A \cong \mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_A^{\text{op}}$ [DMNO13, Corollary 4.1].

If $\mathcal{F}$ is a fusion category, let us denote the Lagrangian algebra $I(1)$ by $A_{\mathcal{F}} = I(1) \in Z(\mathcal{F})$. For $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ we get an étale algebra $A_{\mathcal{F}//\mathcal{G}} \subset A_{\mathcal{F}}$ with $Z(\mathcal{F})^0_{A_{\mathcal{F}//\mathcal{G}}} \cong Z(\mathcal{G})$ given by the order-reversing isomorphism of lattices [DMNO13, Theorem 4.10]. It also follows that $A_{\mathcal{F}}$ is the "composition" of $A_{\mathcal{G}}$ with $A_{\mathcal{F}//\mathcal{G}}$. By this we mean, that $A_{\mathcal{F}//\mathcal{G}} \in \mathcal{C}^0_{A_{\mathcal{G}}}$ is the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{F}} \supset \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{G}}$ in $\mathcal{C}$. Further, every Lagrangian algebra A is of the form $A_{\mathcal{F}}$.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a fusion category, then there is a bijection between the isomorphism classes of Lagrangian algebras in $Z(\mathcal{F})$ and equivalence classes of indecomposeable $\mathcal{F}$-module categories [DMNO13, Proposition 4.8].

Let $\mathcal{C} = Z(\mathcal{F})$ and $A = A_{\mathcal{F}}$. We have that ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A \cong \mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathcal{F}^{\text{op}}$ [DMNO13, Corollary 4.1] and there is a dual algebra (see [EGNO15, Section 7.12]) $B \in \mathcal{D} = {}_A\mathcal{C}_A$, such ${}_B\mathcal{C}_B \cong \mathcal{C}$. It follows from [EGNO15, Propostion 7.13.8, Lemma 8.12.2] that $B = \bigoplus_{X \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{F})} X \boxtimes X^*$ is the canonical algebra, see also [Müg03b].

Proposition B.1. *Let A be a connected étale algebra in a non-degenerately braided fusion category $\mathcal{C}$. Then the inclusion $C_A^{0\,\text{rev}} \to C_A$ is a central functor.*

Conversely, if $\mathcal{D}$ is non-degenerately braided fusion category and $\mathcal{F}$ a fusion category. If there is a central injective (fully faithful) functor $\kappa \colon \mathcal{D}^{\text{rev}} \to \mathcal{F}$, then there is a non-degenerately braided fusion category $\mathcal{C}$ and a connected étale algebra $A \in \mathcal{C}$, such that $\mathcal{F} \cong \mathcal{C}_A$ and $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{C}_A^0$. In this case, $\mathcal{C}$ is given as $C_{Z(\mathcal{F})}(\kappa(\mathcal{D}^{\text{rev}}))$.

Proof. We have $Z(\mathcal{C}_A) = \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_A^{0\,\text{rev}}$ and the first statement follows from [DNO13, Example 3.11].

Conversely, take $\mathcal{C} = C_{Z(\mathcal{F})}(\mathcal{D}^{\text{rev}})$. Then $Z(\mathcal{F}) \cong \mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}^{\text{rev}}$ and we get a Lagrangian algebra $A_{\mathcal{F}}$ in $Z(\mathcal{F})$. We get an étale $A \in \mathcal{C}$ with $A \boxtimes 1 = A_{\mathcal{F}} \cap (\mathcal{C} \boxtimes 1)$ and again from [DNO13, Example 3.11] follows $\mathcal{C}_A^0 \cong \mathcal{D}^{\text{rev}}$. Since $\mathcal{D}^{\text{rev}} \to \mathcal{F}$ is a injective (central) functor $\mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{F}$ is a surjective (central) functor [DNO13, Theorem 3.12]. Let $\tilde{I} \colon \mathcal{F} \to Z(\mathcal{F})$ be the induction functor. Then $\tilde{I}(1)$ is a connected étale algebra in $\mathcal{C}$ isomorphic to A and $\mathcal{F} \cong \mathcal{C}_A$ by [DNO13, Section 2.4]. □

Let $\mathcal{D}$ be non-degenerately braided, and assume we have two fusion categories $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{G}$ with braided central injective functors $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{rev}} \to \mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{D} \to \mathcal{G}$. let us define $\mathcal{F} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{G}$ by

$$\mathcal{F} \boxtimes_{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{G} = {}_R(\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathcal{G})$$

where $R \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{rev}} \boxtimes \mathcal{D}$ is the dual algebra to $A_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{rev}}} \in Z(\mathcal{D})$.

The following reflects [Ocn01, Theorem 11], in the sense that ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ (called subgroup) is a fibered product of $\mathcal{C}_A$ (corresponding the chiral left part) with $\mathcal{C}_A^{\mathrm{op}}$ ($\cong {}_A\mathcal{C}$ corresponding to the chiral right part) over $\mathcal{C}_A^0$ (called the ambichiral part).

Proposition B.2. *Assume A is a connected étale algebra in a non-degenerately braided fusion category $\mathcal{C}$, then ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A \cong \mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes_{\mathcal{C}_A^0} \mathcal{C}_A^{\mathrm{op}}$.*

Proof. We only sketch the proof.

We have $Z(\mathcal{C}_A) = \mathcal{C} \boxtimes (\mathcal{C}_A^0)^{\mathrm{rev}}$. The algebras $A \boxtimes 1 \subset A_{\mathcal{C}_A}$ give the Morita equivalence between $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes (\mathcal{C}_A^0)^{\mathrm{rev}}$ or ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes (\mathcal{C}_A^0)^{\mathrm{rev}}$, respectively, and $\mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_A^{\mathrm{op}}$. The algebra $A_{\mathcal{C}_A}$ is $A \boxtimes 1$ composed with $A_{\mathcal{C}_A^0}$. Let R be the dual algebra of $A_{\mathcal{C}_A^0}$. Then we get ${}_R(\mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_A^{\mathrm{op}})_R \cong {}_A\mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes (\mathcal{C}_A^0)^{\mathrm{rev}}$. This restricts to ${}_R(\mathcal{C}_A^0 \boxtimes (\mathcal{C}_A^0)^{\mathrm{op}})_R \cong \mathcal{C}_A^0 \boxtimes (\mathcal{C}_A^0)^{\mathrm{rev}}$ and ${}_R(\mathcal{C}_A^0 \boxtimes (\mathcal{C}_A^0)^{\mathrm{op}}) \cong \mathcal{C}_A^0$. We conclude that $(\mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_A^{\mathrm{op}})_R \cong {}_A\mathcal{C}_A$. □

Let us denote by ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A^+$ the image of $\mathcal{C}_A \boxtimes 1 \to {}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ and by ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A^-$ the image of $1 \boxtimes \mathcal{C}_A \to {}_A\mathcal{C}_A$. It is easy to see that both inclusions restrict to an equivalence $\mathcal{C}_A^0 \to {}_A\mathcal{C}_A^0$, where ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A^0 = {}_A\mathcal{C}_A^+ \cap {}_A\mathcal{C}_A^-$. In this sense one can see ${}_A\mathcal{C}_A$ also see as a "fibred product"

$${}_A\mathcal{C}_A = {}_A\mathcal{C}_A^+ \boxtimes_{{}_A\mathcal{C}_A^0} {}_A\mathcal{C}_A^- .$$

We get a hypergroup $K = K(\mathcal{F})//K(\mathcal{G})$ and we say that $\mathcal{F}$ is a K-hypergraded extension of $\mathcal{G}$. This generalizes the concept of G-graded extensions for a finite group G.

Remark B.3. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a K-graded extension of $\mathcal{G}$. For every indecomposable $\mathcal{G}$-module category we get $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ Morita equivalent to $\mathcal{G}$ and and an extension $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$, such that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is Morita equivalent to $\mathcal{F}$ and $A_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}//\tilde{\mathcal{G}}} \cong A_{\mathcal{F}//\mathcal{G}}$ in $Z(\mathcal{F}) = Z(\tilde{\mathcal{F}})$. Namely, Lagrangian algebras over $A_{\mathcal{F}//\mathcal{G}}$ are in bijection with Lagrangian algebras in $Z(\mathcal{F})^0_{A_{\mathcal{F}//\mathcal{G}}} \cong Z(\mathcal{G})$ cf. [DMNO13, Proposition 3.16] which are in bijection with indecomposable $\mathcal{G}$ module categories [DMNO13, Proposition 4.8]. Given such a Lagrangian algebra $\tilde{A}$, we take $\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = Z(\mathcal{F})_{\tilde{A}}$. We conjecture that $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is a K-graded extension of $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$. This is true in the unitary case by Corollary 5.18.

The obtained Lagrangian algebra $\tilde{A} \in Z(\mathcal{F})$ with $A_{\mathcal{F}//\mathcal{G}} \subset \tilde{A}$ is a composition of $A_{\mathcal{F}//\mathcal{G}}$ and $A_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}$. Further, $\tilde{A} = A_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}}$ for a fusion category $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ Morita equivalent to $\mathcal{F}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} \subset \tilde{\mathcal{F}}$ is the subcategory associated with the subalgebra $A_{\mathcal{F}//\mathcal{G}} \subset \tilde{A}$. To show that $K(\mathcal{F})//K(\mathcal{G}) \cong K(\tilde{\mathcal{F}})//K(\tilde{\mathcal{G}})$, it is enough to show that the hypergrading just depends on the dual algebra of $A_{\mathcal{F}//\mathcal{G}} = A_{\tilde{\mathcal{F}}//\mathcal{G}}$, for which we just have a proof in the unitary case.

References

[AC82] L. Accardi and C. Cecchini, *Conditional expectations in von Neumann algebras and a theorem of Takesaki*, J. Funct. Anal. **45** (1982), no. 2, 245–273. MR647075

[AGG02] A. Arias, A. Gheondea, and S. Gudder, *Fixed points of quantum operations*, J. Math. Phys. **43** (2002), no. 12, 5872–5881. MR1939622

[BDH88] M. Baillet, Y. Denizeau, and J.-F. Havet, *Indice d'une espérance conditionnelle*, Compositio Math. **66** (1988), no. 2, 199–236. MR945550

[BE00] J. Böckenhauer and D. E. Evans, *Modular invariants from subfactors: Type I coupling matrices and intermediate subfactors*, Comm. Math. Phys. **213** (2000), no. 2, 267–289. MR1785458 (2001g:46142)

[BE98] ———, *Modular invariants, graphs and α-induction for nets of subfactors. I*, Comm. Math. Phys. **197** (1998), no. 2, 361–386, available at `arXiv:hep-th/9801171`. MR1652746 (2000c:46121)

[BE99] ———, *Modular invariants, graphs and α-induction for nets of subfactors. III*, Comm. Math. Phys. **205** (1999), no. 1, 183–228, available at `arXiv:hep-th/9812110`. MR1706884 (2000j:46118)

[BEK00] J. Böckenhauer, D. E. Evans, and Y. Kawahigashi, *Chiral structure of modular invariants for subfactors*, Comm. Math. Phys. **210** (2000), no. 3, 733–784. MR1777347 (2001k:46097)

[BEK01] ———, *Longo-Rehren subfactors arising from α-induction*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **37** (2001), no. 1, 1–35. MR1815993 (2002d:46053)

[BEK99] ———, *On α-induction, chiral generators and modular invariants for subfactors*, Comm. Math. Phys. **208** (1999), no. 2, 429–487. MR1729094 (2001c:81180)

[BGL93] R. Brunetti, D. Guido, and R. Longo, *Modular structure and duality in conformal quantum field theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **156** (1993), 201–219, available at `funct-an/9302008v1`.

[BH95] W. R. Bloom and H. Heyer, *Harmonic analysis of probability measures on hypergroups*, de Gruyter Studies in Mathematics, vol. 20, Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1995. MR1312826

[BH96] D. Bisch and U. Haagerup, *Composition of subfactors: new examples of infinite depth subfactors*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **29** (1996), no. 3, 329–383. MR1386923 (97e:46080)

[Bis12] M. Bischoff, *Models in boundary quantum field theory associated with lattices and loop group models*, Comm. Math. Phys. **315** (2012), no. 3, 827–858. MR2981815

[Bis16a] ———, *The relation between subfactors arising from conformal nets and the realization of quantum doubles*, to appear in the Proceedings in honor of Vaughan F. R. Jones' 60th birthday conferences, 2016.

[Bis16b] ———, *A Remark on CFT Realization of Quantum Doubles of Subfactors: Case Index < 4*, Lett. Math. Phys. **106** (2016), no. 3, 341–363. MR3462031

[BKL15] M. Bischoff, Y. Kawahigashi, and R. Longo, *Characterization of 2D rational local conformal nets and its boundary conditions: the maximal case*, Doc. Math. **20** (2015), 1137–1184. MR3424476

[BKLR15] M. Bischoff, Y. Kawahigashi, R. Longo, and K.-H. Rehren, *Tensor categories and endomorphisms of von Neumann algebras—with applications to quantum field theory*, Springer Briefs in Mathematical Physics, vol. 3, Springer, Cham, 2015. MR3308880

[BKLR16] ———, *Phase Boundaries in Algebraic Conformal QFT*, Comm. Math. Phys. **342** (2016), no. 1, 1–45. MR3455144

[Car04] S. Carpi, *On the representation theory of Virasoro nets*, Comm. Math. Phys. **244** (2004), no. 2, 261–284. MR2031030 (2005e:81128)

[Car98] ———, *Absence of subsystems for the Haag-Kastler net generated by the energy-momentum tensor in two-dimensional conformal field theory*, Lett. Math. Phys. **45** (1998), no. 3, 259–267. MR1641204

[Cho74] M. D. Choi, *A Schwarz inequality for positive linear maps on C^* -algebras*, Illinois J. Math. **18** (1974), 565–574. MR0355615

[Con73] A. Connes, *Une classification des facteurs de type III*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.(4) **6** (1973), 133–252.

[Con77] ———, *Periodic automorphisms of the hyperfinite factor of type II1*, Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged) **39** (1977), no. 1-2, 39–66. MR0448101

[Con94] ———, *Non-commutative geometry*, Academic Press, San Diego, 1994.

[DHR71] S. Doplicher, R. Haag, and J. E. Roberts, *Local observables and particle statistics. I*, Comm. Math. Phys. **23** (1971), 199–230. MR0297259 (45 #6316)

[DM97] C. Dong and G. Mason, *On quantum Galois theory*, Duke Math. J. **86** (1997), no. 2, 305–321. MR1430435

[DMNO13] A. Davydov, M. Müger, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik, *The Witt group of non-degenerate braided fusion categories*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **677** (2013), 135–177. MR3039775

[DNO13] A. Davydov, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik, *On the structure of the Witt group of braided fusion categories*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **19** (2013), no. 1, 237–269. MR3022755

[DR89a] S. Doplicher and J. E. Roberts, *Endomorphisms of C^*-algebras, cross products and duality for compact groups*, Ann. of Math. (2) **130** (1989), no. 1, 75–119. MR1005608

[DR89b] ———, *A new duality theory for compact groups*, Invent. Math. **98** (1989), no. 1, 157–218. MR1010160 (90k:22005)

[DR90] ———, *Why there is a field algebra with a compact gauge group describing the superselection structure in particle physics*, Comm. Math. Phys. **131** (1990), no. 1, 51–107. MR1062748

[EG11] D. E. Evans and T. Gannon, *The exoticness and realisability of twisted Haagerup-Izumi modular data*, Comm. Math. Phys. **307** (2011), no. 2, 463–512. MR2837122 (2012m:17040)

[EG14] ———, *Near-group fusion categories and their doubles*, Adv. Math. **255** (2014), 586–640. MR3167494

[EGNO15] P. Etingof, S. Gelaki, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik, *Tensor categories*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 205, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015. MR3242743

[ENO10] P. Etingof, D. Nikshych, and V. Ostrik, *Fusion categories and homotopy theory*, Quantum Topol. **1** (2010), no. 3, 209–273. With an appendix by Ehud Meir. MR2677836

[EP15] D. E. Evans and M. Pugh, *Spectral measures for G_2*, Comm. Math. Phys. **337** (2015), no. 3, 1161–1197. MR3339174

[FFRS10] J. Fröhlich, J. Fuchs, I. Runkel, and C. Schweigert, *Defect lines, dualities and generalised orbifolds*, XVIth International Congress on Mathematical Physics, 2010, pp. 608–613. MR2730830

[FJ96] K. Fredenhagen and M. Jörß, *Conformal Haag-Kastler nets, pointlike localized fields and the existence of operator product expansions*, Comm. Math. Phys. **176** (1996), no. 3, 541–554.

[FRS04] J. Fuchs, I. Runkel, and C. Schweigert, *TFT construction of RCFT correlators. III. Simple currents*, Nuclear Phys. B **694** (2004), no. 3, 277–353. MR2076134 (2005e:81209)

[FRS89] K. Fredenhagen, K.-H. Rehren, and B. Schroer, *Superselection sectors with braid group statistics and exchange algebras. I. General theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **125** (1989), no. 2, 201–226. MR1016869 (91c:81047)

[GF93] F. Gabbiani and J. Fröhlich, *Operator algebras and conformal field theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **155** (1993), no. 3, 569–640.

[GL92] D. Guido and R. Longo, *Relativistic invariance and charge conjugation in quantum field theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **148** (1992), no. 3, 521–551. MR1181069

[Haa87] U. Haagerup, *Connes' bicentralizer problem and uniqueness of the injective factor of type* III_1, Acta Math. **158** (1987), no. 1-2, 95–148. MR880070 (88f:46117)

[HKL15] Y.-Z. Huang, A. Kirillov Jr., and J. Lepowsky, *Braided tensor categories and extensions of vertex operator algebras*, Comm. Math. Phys. **337** (2015), no. 3, 1143–1159. MR3339173

[HY00] T. Hayashi and S. Yamagami, *Amenable tensor categories and their realizations as AFD bimodules*, J. Funct. Anal. **172** (2000), no. 1, 19–75. MR1749868 (2001d:46092)

[ILP98] M. Izumi, R. Longo, and S. Popa, *A Galois correspondence for compact groups of automorphisms of von Neumann algebras with a generalization to Kac algebras*, J. Funct. Anal. **155** (1998), no. 1, 25–63. MR1622812 (2000c:46117)

[Izu00] M. Izumi, *The Structure of Sectors Associated with Longo–Rehren Inclusions I. General Theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **213** (2000), 127–179.

[Izu01] ———, *The structure of sectors associated with Longo-Rehren inclusions. II. Examples*, Rev. Math. Phys. **13** (2001), no. 5, 603–674. MR1832764 (2002k:46161)

[Izu15] ———, *A Cuntz algebra approach to the classification of near-group categories*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1512.04288 (2015).

[Izu91] ———, *Application of fusion rules to classification of subfactors*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **27** (1991), no. 6, 953–994. MR1145672

[JMS14] V. F. R. Jones, S. Morrison, and N. Snyder, *The classification of subfactors of index at most 5*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **51** (2014), no. 2, 277–327. MR3166042

[Jon80] V. F. R. Jones, *Actions of finite groups on the hyperfinite type* II_1 *factor*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **28** (1980), no. 237, v+70. MR587749

[JS97] V. Jones and V. S. Sunder, *Introduction to subfactors*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 234, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997. MR1473221 (98h:46067)

[Kad52] R. V. Kadison, *A generalized Schwarz inequality and algebraic invariants for operator algebras*, Ann. of Math. (2) **56** (1952), 494–503. MR0051442

[Kaw02] Y. Kawahigashi, *Generalized Longo-Rehren subfactors and α-induction*, Comm. Math. Phys. **226** (2002), no. 2, 269–287. MR1892455

[KL04] Y. Kawahigashi and R. Longo, *Classification of local conformal nets. Case $c < 1$.*, Ann. Math. **160** (2004), no. 2, 493–522.

[KLM01] Y. Kawahigashi, R. Longo, and M. Müger, *Multi-Interval Subfactors and Modularity of Representations in Conformal Field Theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **219** (2001), 631–669, available at `arXiv:math/9903104`.

[KO02] Jr. A. Kirillov and V. Ostrik, *On a q-analogue of the McKay correspondence and the ADE classification of* $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ *conformal field theories*, Adv. Math. **171** (2002), no. 2, 183–227. MR1936496 (2003j:17019)

[Lon03] R. Longo, *Conformal Subnets and Intermediate Subfactors*, Comm. Math. Phys. **237** (2003), 7–30, available at `arXiv:math/0102196v2[math.OA]`.

[Lon79] ———, *Notes on algebraic invariants for noncommutative dynamical systems*, Comm. Math. Phys. **69** (1979), no. 3, 195–207. MR550019 (80j:46108)

[Lon89] ———, *Index of subfactors and statistics of quantum fields. I*, Comm. Math. Phys. **126** (1989), 217–247.

[Lon94] ———, *A duality for Hopf algebras and for subfactors. I*, Comm. Math. Phys. **159** (1994), no. 1, 133–150. MR1257245 (95h:46097)

[LR95] R. Longo and K.-H. Rehren, *Nets of Subfactors*, Rev. Math. Phys. **7** (1995), 567–597, available at `arXiv:hep-th/9411077`.

[LR97] R. Longo and J. E. Roberts, *A theory of dimension*, K-Theory **11** (1997), no. 2, 103–159, available at `arXiv:funct-an/9604008v1`. MR1444286 (98i:46065)

[Müg03a] M. Müger, *From subfactors to categories and topology. I. Frobenius algebras in and Morita equivalence of tensor categories*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **180** (2003), no. 1-2, 81–157. MR1966524 (2004f:18013)

[Müg03b] ———, *From subfactors to categories and topology. II. The quantum double of tensor categories and subfactors*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **180** (2003), no. 1-2, 159–219. MR1966525 (2004f:18014)

[Müg03c] ———, *On the structure of modular categories*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **87** (2003), no. 2, 291–308. MR1990929

[Müg05] ———, *Conformal Orbifold Theories and Braided Crossed G-Categories*, Comm. Math. Phys. **260** (2005), 727–762.

[Müg10] ———, *On superselection theory of quantum fields in low dimensions*, XVIth International Congress on Mathematical Physics, 2010, pp. 496–503. MR2730815 (2012i:81165)

[NSZ03] C. P. Niculescu, A. Ströh, and L. Zsidó, *Noncommutative extensions of classical and multiple recurrence theorems*, J. Operator Theory **50** (2003), no. 1, 3–52. MR2015017

[Ocn01] A. Ocneanu, *Operator algebras, topology and subgroups of quantum symmetry—construction of subgroups of quantum groups*, Taniguchi Conference on Mathematics Nara '98, 2001, pp. 235–263. MR1865095 (2002j:57059)

[Ost03] V. Ostrik, *Fusion categories of rank 2*, Math. Res. Lett. **10** (2003), no. 2-3, 177–183. MR1981895

[Pas73] W. L. Paschke, *Inner product modules over B^*-algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **182** (1973), 443–468. MR0355613

[Pop95] S. Popa, *Classification of subfactors and their endomorphisms*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol. 86, Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995. MR1339767 (96d:46085)

[Reh00] K.-H. Rehren, *Canonical tensor product subfactors*, Comm. Math. Phys. **211** (2000), no. 2, 395–406. MR1754521 (2001d:46093)

[Reh94] ———, *A new view of the Virasoro algebra*, Lett. Math. Phys. **30** (1994), no. 2, 125–130. MR1264993 (95b:81194)

[Sun92] V. S. Sunder, II_1 *factors, their bimodules and hypergroups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **330** (1992), no. 1, 227–256. MR1049618 (92f:46076)

[SW03] V. S. Sunder and N. J. Wildberger, *Actions of finite hypergroups*, J. Algebraic Combin. **18** (2003), no. 2, 135–151. MR2002621

[SW86] A. N. Schellekens and N. P. Warner, *Conformal subalgebras of Kac-Moody algebras*, Phys. Rev. D (3) **34** (1986), no. 10, 3092–3096. MR867023

[Tak03] M. Takesaki, *Theory of operator algebras. III*, Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, vol. 127, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. Operator Algebras and Non-commutative Geometry, 8. MR1943007 (2004g:46080)

[Tak72] ———, *Conditional expectations in von Neumann algebras*, J. Functional Analysis **9** (1972), 306–321. MR0303307

[TY98] D. Tambara and S. Yamagami, *Tensor categories with fusion rules of self-duality for finite abelian groups*, J. Algebra **209** (1998), no. 2, 692–707. MR1659954

[Was90] A. Wassermann, *Subfactors arising from positive energy representations of some infinite dimensional groups*, unpublished notes (1990).

[Wil97] N. J. Wildberger, *Duality and entropy of finite commutative hypergroups and fusion rule algebras*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **56** (1997), no. 2, 275–291. MR1489137

[Xu00] F. Xu, *Algebraic orbifold conformal field theories*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **97** (2000), no. 26, 14069, available at `arXiv:math/0004150v1[math.QA]`.

[Xu05] ———, *Strong additivity and conformal nets*, Pacific J. Math. **221** (2005), no. 1, 167–199. MR2194151 (2007b:81132)

[Xu14] ———, *On intermediate conformal nets*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **692** (2014), 125–151. MR3274549

[Xu98a] ———, *Applications of braided endomorphisms from conformal inclusions*, Internat. Math. Res. Notices **1** (1998), 5–23. MR1601870

[Xu98b] ———, *New braided endomorphisms from conformal inclusions*, Comm. Math. Phys. **192** (1998), no. 2, 349–403. MR1617550

Current address: Vanderbilt University, Department of Mathematics, 1326 Stevenson Center, Nashville, TN 37240, USA

E-mail address: `marcel.bischoff@vanderbilt.edu`